4.8 RESOURCE USE PATTERNS

4.8.1 INTRODUCTION

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

A detailed traffic study was developed for the Proposed Action and alternatives. This study and its associated appendices are presented within **Appendix O** of this EIS.

Study Area

All of the Alternatives, except Alternative G, would generate new vehicle trips that would increase traffic volumes on the nearby street networks. To assess changes in traffic conditions, thirty-one intersections, ten freeway segments and twenty-six freeway segments and ramps were evaluated for Alternatives A-E and H. Fifteen intersections, twenty-nine highway segments and ramps were evaluated for Alternative F. **Section 3.8** lists the study intersections and freeway segments and ramps.

Methodologies

This traffic analysis is based on planning conditions assumed in the Rohnert Park General Plan (adopted July 2000), the Sonoma County General Plan (adopted 1989), as well as information provided by Caltrans and Sonoma County Regional Transportation Authority. The different situations analyzed in this section are:

- 2008 Without Project: The analysis is based on background traffic volumes and a street network anticipated to occur in the year 2008 without development of the project alternatives; and
- 2008 Plus Project: The analysis is based on background traffic volumes and a street network anticipated to occur in the year 2008 with the development of project alternatives.

Refer to **Section 3.8** for discussion of existing conditions, **Section 4.12** for discussion of cumulative conditions (2020), and **Section 5.2.7** for discussion of mitigation measures.

Figure 4.8-1 illustrates the 2008 lane geometry and traffic control in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites. **Figure 4.8-23** illustrates the 2008 lane geometry and traffic control in the vicinity of the Lakeville site.

Figure 4.8-1

To reflect the traffic levels anticipated to occur in the year 2008, annual growth rates were determined for study intersections based on the year 2020 forecast contained in the Rohnert Park General Plan. These rates were applied to the existing traffic volumes to increase the turning movement counts between the time they were collected and the year 2008. The rate of increase per year varies on location and proximity to planned development, however the average increase is roughly two-percent per year. (**Appendix O**). **Figure 4.8-2** shows the projected 2008 traffic volumes without the project.

Traffic analysis for all alternatives was completed using Synchro software at signalized intersections and Highway Capacity Software (HCS) at intersections, ramps, and freeway segments. Both software programs are based on the methodology of the *Highway Capacity Manual*.

Analysis Methodologies

Operating conditions experienced by drivers are described in terms of Level of Service (LOS). This term is a qualitative measure that includes factors such as speed, travel time, delay, freedom to maneuver, and driving comfort and convenience. LOS is represented as letters ranging from LOS A to LOS F, whereby LOS A represents the best traffic-flow driving conditions and LOS F represents the worst traffic-flow driving conditions. See **Section 3.8.1** for more discussion of the analysis methodologies used and **Table 3.8-1** for intersection LOS definitions.

Analysis of Significance

Significance of impacts is based on acceptable LOS, as determined by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, the Sonoma County Guidelines for Traffic Studies, and the Rohnert Park General Plan. See **Section 3.8.1** for further discussion of the LOS standards.

Traffic signals may be justified when traffic operations fall below acceptable thresholds and when one or more signal warrants are satisfied. Traffic volumes at the unsignalized study intersections were assessed using the peak hour warrant in the Caltrans Traffic Manual. Traffic Signal Warrant #3 – Peak Hour Volume Warrant is satisfied when traffic volumes on the major and minor approaches exceed thresholds for one hour of the day. This warrant is generally the first warrant to be satisfied. The warrant applies to traffic conditions during a one-hour peak that are sufficiently high such that minor street traffic experiences excessive delay in entering and crossing the street.

Figure 4.8-2

2008 Condition –Build-Out Without Project

Major roadway improvements are currently planned in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites. No major roadway improvement projects were identified in the vicinity of the Lakeville site prior to 2008. More detailed discussion of planned improvements is contained in **Appendix O**.

Planned Caltrans improvements to the roadway network in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites that are expected to occur in 2008 include the addition of High Occupancy Vehicle lanes (HOV) to the US-101 freeway from SR-37 through Santa Rosa and the reconstruction of the US-101/Wilfred Avenue interchange.

The interchange reconstruction will connect Golf Course Drive directly with Wilfred Avenue and raise the freeway over the new street connection. Commerce Drive under the freeway (between Golf Course Drive and Redwood Drive) will be removed in the long-term, but will remain in the near-term.

With the reconstruction of the US-101/Wilfred Avenue interchange, auxiliary lanes will be constructed from the Rohnert Park Expressway Overcrossing to the Wilfred Avenue interchange and northbound from Wilfred Avenue to Santa Rosa Avenue Overcrossing. The existing northbound and southbound on-ramps at Wilfred Avenue will be widened for ramp metering which will be installed with the completion of the interchange. According to Caltrans, the interchange will remain open during construction, including the freeway ramps. The project will be constructed in three general phases:

1. Build collector-distributor road from Santa Rosa interchange and southbound on-ramp.
2. Demolish and build northbound structures.
3. Demolish and build southbound structures.

Environmental studies for the proposed interchange project are completed and the design phase is currently in progress with reconstruction planned to begin in 2008 and be completed by 2011. Because the interchange is expected to be completed at approximately the same time or closely following development occurring under Alternatives A through E, it was assumed that the US-101/Wilfred Avenue interchange was completed in the 2008 analysis scenarios.

Caltrans also plans to add HOV lanes to the US-101 freeway from SR-37 through Santa Rosa. HOV lane projects near the Wilfred and Stony Point sites are as follows:

- HOV lanes on US-101 from Old Redwood Highway (in Petaluma) to Rohnert Park Expressway. Construction would start approximately 2009 or 2010. Environmental

studies are currently underway, but actual construction may be delayed due to funding limitations.

- HOV lanes on US-101 from Rohnert Park Expressway to Wilfred Avenue. This project is to be completed at the same time as the Wilfred Avenue interchange. Environmental studies are currently underway, but actual construction may be delayed due to funding limitations.
- HOV lanes on US-101 from Wilfred Avenue to SR-12 (Santa Rosa). This project was completed in 2003.

Other intersection projects are identified in the Rohnert Park General Plan. Some of the projects are intended to increase intersection capacities near the US-101 interchanges. Wilfred Avenue would be widened to four lanes plus left-turn lanes from the 1999 City Limits to the Urban Growth Boundary (at Langner Avenue). The left-turn lanes on Wilfred Avenue were assumed to be 150 feet long.

In addition, the City plans to construct an overpass across US-101 that connects Business Park Drive to the west with State Farm Drive to the east. Exact configuration of the overpass has not been determined by the city; therefore, lane geometry in this evaluation was assumed based on engineering judgment.

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Table 4.8-1 summarizes the 2008 baseline freeway segment and ramp performance condition in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites. As shown in **Table 4.8-1**, no freeway segment would operate unacceptably in the 2008 baseline condition.

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes at study intersections are provided as a baseline. Significant delays are expected, particularly at the Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road intersection and on Wilfred Avenue from Labath Avenue to Redwood Drive. **Table 4.8-2** shows the baseline 2008 LOS at study intersections in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites. The signal control is listed as TS for a signalized intersection and TWSC for a two-way stop-controlled intersection. The overall intersection LOS is reported for signalized intersections. For unsignalized intersections only the worst approach LOS is reported. Additional detail is provided in **Appendix O**.

TABLE 4.8-1
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE - 2008 WITHOUT PROJECT
WILFRED AND STONY POINT SITES

		2008	
US-101 Segment/Ramp	**Criteria LOS**	**LOS**	**Density (PC/MI/LN)[1]**
Northbound			
US-101 South of SR 116	E	C	19.1
SR-116 Off-ramp	E	C	27.4
SR-116 On-ramp	E	D	29.5
US-101 between SR-116 and Rohnert Park Expressway (NB)	E	C	23.5
Rohnert Park Expressway NB Off-Ramp	E	D	28.8
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	C	21.8
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp	E	C	22.1
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (NB)	E	C	22.1
Wilfred Ave NB Off-Ramp	E	C	22.1
Wilfred Ave NB On-Ramp	E	D	30.3
US-101 between Wilfred Ave and Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	30.3
Santa Rosa Avenue NB Off-ramp	E	D	30.3
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	22.0
Southbound			
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	24.1
Santa Rosa Avenue On-ramp	E	//[2]	//[2]
US-101 between Santa Rosa Avenue and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	D	32.7
Wilfred Ave SB Off-Ramp	E	E	38.8
Wilfred Ave SB On-Ramp	E	D	33.4
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	D	33.4
Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp	E	D	33.4
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	30.9
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp	E	D	30.1
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and SR-116 (SB)	E	C	22.3
SR-116 SB Off-ramp	E	D	29.2
SR-116 SB On-ramp	E	D	32.1
US-101 South of SR-116	E	C	21.8

NOTE: 1 - pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
2 - Intersection no longer exists due to planned roadway improvement.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

TABLE 4.8-2
2008 PM PEAK INTERSECTION CONDITIONS WITHOUT PROJECT
WILFRED AND STONY POINT SITES

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 without Project	
				LOS	Delay[1]
1	Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**495.5**
2	Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue	TWSC	D	B	11.4
3	Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue	TWSC	D	B	11.4
4	Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue	TWSC	D	B	11.3
5	Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	F	**77.4**
6	Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	623.3
7	Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive	TS	D	**E**	**77.6**
8	Redwood Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	26.0
9	Wilfred Avenue/ US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	C	23.2
10	Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**E**	**71.7**
11	Golf Course Drive/Roberts Lake Road	TS	C	B	18.3
12	US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	D	46.7
13	Project Driveway/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	A	0.0
14	Business Park Drive/Labath Avenue	-	D	*I*[2]	*I*[2]
15	Business Park Drive/Redwood Drive	TWSC	D	D	27.5
16	Rohnert Park Expressway/Stony Point Road	TS	D	B	19.1
17	Rohnert Park Expressway/Labath Avenue	TS	C	C	25.8
18	Rohnert Park Expressway/Redwood Drive	TS	C	C	26.3
19	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	B	16.9
20	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 NB Ramps	TS	D	B	10.8
21	Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	**D**	**44.6**
22	Gravenstein Hwy/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	37.1
23	Gravenstein Hwy/Redwood Drive	TS	D	C	26.2
24	Gravenstein Hwy/SB US-101 Ramps	TS	D	B	19.9
25	Gravenstein Hwy/NB US-101 Off-ramp	TS	D	B	11.5
26	Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**E**	**43.5**
27	Millbrae Ave/Primrose Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
28	Millbrae Ave/Whistler Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
29	Millbrae Ave/Langner Ave	TWSC	D	A	9.9
30	Millbrae Ave/Labath Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
31	Millbrae Ave/Dowdell Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.4

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 without Project	
				LOS	Delay[1]

NOTE: 1 - Delay in seconds.
2 - Intersection only exists under Alternative A with project. Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

The following intersections and approaches would fail to meet acceptable LOS thresholds under the 2008 Without Project Condition:

- Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue
- Labath Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Dowdell Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Redwood Drive/Wilfred Avenue
- Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard
- Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Near-term and long-term traffic volumes (without the project) at unsignalized study intersections were compared against the peak hour warrant in the *2003 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)* and the *California Supplement*.

Results of the analysis showed that the following intersection would satisfy traffic signal (TS) Warrant #3 by the year 2008:

- Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue
- Dowdell Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

LAND USE

Land use regulations for Sonoma County and the City of Rohnert Park would not apply to land that is taken into trust. The only applicable land use regulations would be federal or Tribal. The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria rely upon the Tribal Council, the governing body of the Tribal Government, to guide and regulate land use on tribal lands.

Select goals, objectives, and policies of the Sonoma County General Plan (see **Table 4.8-3**) and the City of Rohnert Park General Plan (see **Table 4.8-4**) are shown in relation to the proposed development Alternatives.

TABLE 4.8-3
SONOMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

	Sonoma County General Plan Consistency					
	Alternatives A and H	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**	**Alternative F**
Land Use Element[a]						
Goal LU-3 Locate future growth within the cities and unincorporated urban service areas in a compact manner using vacant "infill" parcels and lands next to existing development at the edge of these areas.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this goal, development would take place adjacent to and at the edge of other development in Rohnert Park.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal, although this alternative would not facilitate further development outside of the cities and unincorporated urban service areas.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
Policy LU-3c Avoid extension of sewer or water services outside of a sphere of influence or urban service area, except to resolve an existing public health hazard, where a substantial overriding public benefit would result, or for property located within a water district boundary as of March 1989.	Alternatives A and H are inconsistent with this policy. Water and wastewater service for the project is not within the Rohnert Park sphere of influence.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this policy.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
Goal LU-5 Identify important open space areas between the county's cities and communities and maintain their open or natural character with low intensities of development.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this goal. The portion of the site that is in an open space corridor would be retained.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal. However, approximately 76 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would be removed from their natural open setting.	Same as Alternative B, although approximately 101 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would be removed from their natural open setting.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B, although approximately 79 acres out of the 322 total Lakeville site acres would be removed from their natural open setting.
Objective LU-5.1 Retain low intensities of use in open space "separators" between cities and communities along the	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this objective.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this objective.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Not applicable

	Sonoma County General Plan Consistency					
	Alternatives A and H	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**	**Alternative F**
Highway 101 corridor and within the central Sonoma County area.						
Policy LU-5c Avoid commercial and industrial land uses in community separators, except those allowed in the agricultural and resource categories. Consider amendments for outdoor recreational or other uses with a low intensity of structures only in those community separators along the Highway 101 corridor.	Alternatives A and H would be inconsistent with this policy.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Not applicable
Goal LU-8 Protect lands currently in agricultural production and lands with characteristics that make them potentially suitable for agricultural use. Retain large parcel sizes and avoid incompatible non-agricultural uses.	Alternatives A and H are inconsistent with this goal.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal. However, approximately 71.68 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would become an incompatible non-agricultural use.	Same as Alternative B, although approximately 79.79 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would become an incompatible non-agricultural use.	Same as Alternative B, although approximately 61.80 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would become an incompatible non-agricultural use.	Same as Alternative B, although approximately 59.09 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would become an incompatible non-agricultural use.	Same as Alternative B, although approximately 78.75 acres out of the 322 total Lakeville site acres would become an incompatible non-agricultural use.
Objective LU-8.1 Avoid conversion of lands currently used for agricultural production to non-agricultural use.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this objective. The portion of the site that is currently used for agriculture or grazing would not be developed.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this objective. However, approximately 71.68 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would be converted to non-agricultural production.	Approximately 79.79 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would be converted to non-agricultural production.	Approximately 61.80 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would be converted to non-agricultural production.	Approximately 59.09 acres out of the 360 total Stony Point site acres would be converted to non-agricultural production.	Approximately 78.75 acres out of the 322 total Lakeville site acres would be converted to non-agricultural production.

	Sonoma County General Plan Consistency					
	Alternatives A and H	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**	**Alternative F**
Objective LU-8.2 Retain large parcels in agricultural production areas and avoid new parcels less than 20 acres in the "Land Intensive Agriculture" category.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this objective. The project does not remove parcels from agricultural production or create new parcels less than 20 acres in size.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this objective.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
Goal LU-9 Uses and intensities of any land development shall be consistent with preservation of important biotic resource areas and scenic features.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this goal.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal. Minimization measures would be incorporated into the project to reduce impacts to biotic resource areas and scenic features.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
Open Space Element[a]						
Goal OS-1 Preserve the visual identities of communities by maintaining open space areas between cities and communities.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this goal.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal. The developed area is 76 acres in size.	Same as Alternative B. The developed area is 101 acres in size.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B. The developed area is 79 acres in size.
Objective OS-1.1 Preserve important open space areas in the community separators shown on Figures OS-5a through OS-5i of the Open Space Element.	Alternatives A and H would be inconsistent with this objective.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Not applicable
Objective OS-1.4 Preserve existing specimen trees and tree stands within community separator areas.	Alternatives A and H would be consistent with this objective.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Not applicable

	Sonoma County General Plan Consistency					
	Alternatives A and H	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**	**Alternative F**
Policy OS-1b Avoid commercial or industrial uses in community separators, except those that are permitted by the agricultural or resource land use categories. Consider amendments for outdoor recreational and other uses with a low intensity of structures only in those community separators along the Highway 101 Corridor.	Alternatives A and H would be inconsistent with this policy.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Not applicable
Policy OS-2b Avoid commercial or industrial uses in scenic landscape units, except those that are permitted by the agricultural or resource land use categories.	Alternatives And H are consistent with this policy.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this policy.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Not applicable

NOTE: [a]Information is summarized in this table, a more detailed discussion of the GP is included in **Section 3.8** of the EIS.
SOURCE: Sonoma County General Plan, 1989; AES, 2006.

TABLE 4.8-4
CITY OF ROHNERT PARK GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Section	City of Rohnert Park General Plan Consistency				
	Alternatives A and H	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
Growth Management Element[a]					
Goal GM-G Require all urban development in the Rohnert Park Planning Area to be located within the Urban Growth Boundary	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this goal.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
Open Space Element[a]					
Goal OS-A Maintain a greenbelt around the city that provides a physical and visual space between Rohnert Park-Cotati and Santa Rosa, Petaluma, and Penngrove.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this goal.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
Goal OS-B Maintain land surrounding the city as open space.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this goal.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this goal.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
Policy OS-4A Only land within the Rohnert Park Planning Area is suitable for mitigating impacts to the Community Separator. First priority: • Lands adjacent to the Urban Growth Boundary; • Lands that would serve as "green belts" around the City of Rohnert Park; and • View corridors along Petaluma Hill Road. Second priority: • View corridors along Railroad Avenue and Stony Point Road; • Prime Farmland • Lands under Williamson Act agreements; and • Environmentally sensitive habitat areas.	Alternatives A and H are consistent with this policy.	Alternative B would be inconsistent with this policy.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B

NOTE: [a]Information in this table is discussed in **Table 3.8-8** in **Section 3.8** of the EIS.
SOURCE: City of Rohnert Park General Plan, 2000; AES, 2006

4.8.2 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

This subsection discusses the Build-Out traffic conditions with the project trips calculated for Alternative A added to the baseline condition.

Site Access

Main access points to the project would be located on Langner Avenue and Labath Avenue via Wilfred Avenue. These approaches are assumed to operate as full movement driveways with no turn limitations. The project would extend Labath Avenue to the south to intersect Business Park Drive. A third project access would be on Labath Avenue just north of Business Park Drive and is assumed to be a full-movement driveway with no turn limitations.

Construction Impacts

The day-to-day construction operations for Alternative A would include traffic impacts related to construction employees, fill, and construction material importation. The principal activities expected to generate traffic related to the construction are: employee trips, heavy equipment delivery, and construction materials import.

Employee trips are based on the number of employees estimated to be on-site during different points throughout the project. Each employee is assumed to drive to and from the site alone each day and it is assumed that 20 percent of the workers leave and return to the site for various purposes during the day. Heavy equipment delivery is based on the number of large construction vehicles expected during the project duration. Construction materials importation is based on the number of trucks required to deliver construction materials to the site, and includes building materials such as wood, steel, and masonry.

Using the expected traffic information above, construction-related traffic generation was estimated. Construction activity would generate different volumes of traffic at different points in the project. For example, the delivery and removal of heavy equipment to the site would happen only a few times during the project duration. The construction-related employee traffic is expected to remain relatively consistent throughout the project. It is estimated that it would take 27 months to complete construction of the Alternative A developments, including 5 months for the grading of the site.

Employees – There would be 600 to 800 employees on-site during construction. Construction workers arrival would peak between 6:30 AM and 7:30 AM, and departure would peak between 4:00 PM and 5:00 PM. This AM this peak is prior to the area wide commute peak of 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM. In the evening, there would be a period of overlap in the employee commute peak and the area wide commute peak of 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM. The impacts of construction related

employee traffic would have only a brief period of overlap with commuter peak and would not cause any significant impacts.

Workers would generate peak parking demand equivalent to roughly 800 vehicles during the peak construction period. Additional deliveries, visits, and other activities may generate peak non-worker parking demand of up to another 50 trucks and autos. Therefore, an approximate demand of 850 vehicle parking spaces would be required during the peak construction period for the construction employees. It is anticipated that this demand would be met on-site. Alternatively, the project could lease a remote lot and shuttle employees to the construction site. Thus, parking demand would not significantly impact the nearby community.

Heavy Equipment – Approximately 30 pieces of heavy equipment would be used based on wide-load permits necessary throughout construction. Delivery and removal of heavy equipment would occur outside of the area-wide commute peak and equipment would be moved in and out of the site on different days. The periodic delivery of heavy equipment during off-peak hours would constitute a minimum disruption of traffic.

Construction Material Import – It is estimated that 300,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required to develop the site for Alternative A. It is expected that construction of the proposed project would involve 25,000 cubic yards of earthwork from an on-site location adjacent to the development area, which would not generate any traffic on the surrounding roadways.

275,000 cubic yards of fill would be taken from an on-site location separated from the development area which would generate traffic on the surrounding roadways. The on-site separated location is the southern portion of the Wilfred site where truck traffic would travel on an approximately 5 mile loop from Rohnert Park Expressway to Stony Point Road to Wilfred Avenue to Redwood and back to Rohnert Park Expressway. Trucks would leave/enter the on-site fill location at the Rohnert Park Expressway driveway just east of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel. The trucks would leave/enter the development area at the Wilfred/Labath intersection. Based on a carrying capacity of 12 cubic yards per truck, it is estimated that it would take approximately 22,917 trucks to complete this task. Doubling to account for the inbound and outbound component of each round trip, this would result in approximately 45,834 trip ends. Assuming that these were spread out over a period of 5 months, with trucks operating at 6 days per week, 10 hours per day, this would result in 191 trucks making 382 trip ends on an average day with 19 trucks making 38 trip ends in any given hour (including potentially the peak hour) on the 5 mile loop.

Once the site is graded, Alternative A would require importation of construction material including raw materials, the building pad, concrete, parking lot base and asphalt paving. As a result somewhere between 3,000 to 4,000 truckloads of material would be delivered over

approximately 23 months. The importation would require approximately 8 to 9 truck trips per day. Each truck would generate one inbound and one outbound trip accounting for 2 trips. Therefore, during the peak construction period the project would generate about 18 truck trips ends per day. Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less than the project's equivalent passenger car traffic generation and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it would not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection.

Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less traffic than the project's equivalent operational passenger car traffic generation (even when added to employee trips) and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it should not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection. The construction traffic impact would represent a temporary and less-than-significant inconvenience to travelers on affected roadways and area residents. However, this level of truck traffic may have an impact on quality of life including increased noise, visual impact, and a perception of lower traffic safety. Tracking of debris and mud onto roadways may also create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction.

Project Trip Generation

Trip generation was calculated based on the previous discussions and is reported in **Table 4.8-5.** As seen in this table, Alternative A is expected to generate 1,384 new trips in the AM and 2,287 new trips in the weekday PM peak hour. Since Alternatives A, B and C all propose casinos with the same amount of gaming and hotel space, trip generation numbers are the same for all three alternatives. Although project trip generation was prepared for daily, AM peak period, and PM peak periods, only the PM traffic conditions were used to evaluate impacts caused by the project. More trips would be generated by the casino facility on Saturday evenings than during the weekdays, but the background traffic is lower at that time, resulting in an overall lower number of vehicles on the road. As such, the weekday PM peak hour is used to evaluate potential impacts from the project. PM peak time represents the time period when the project would contribute to the greatest amount of congestion and have the highest potential mitigation; therefore, the PM peak represents the worst-case period to evaluate. **Figure 4.8-3** shows the project-generated PM traffic volumes for Alternative A.

Sometimes developments also attract trips already on the road that stop as they pass by the site. These are not new vehicle trips and are considered to be pass-by trips. Although some trips to the

Figure 4.8-3

site would be pass-by trips, no empirical data was readily available to determine a reasonable pass-by rate. Therefore, pass-by trips are conservatively not assumed in the analysis.

TABLE 4.8-5
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION – ALTERNATIVE A

	Trips						
	Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Entering	Exiting	Total	Entering	Exiting	Total
Casino & Entertainment 450,000 sf[1]	17,744	930	398	1,328	1,181	1,047	2,228
Hotel & Spa 300 room[2]	817	34	22	56	31	28	59
Net New Vehicle Trips	*18,261*	*964*	*420*	*1,384*	*1,212*	*1,075*	*2,287*

NOTE: 1 sf = square foot
2 Hotel trip rate is reduced by 2/3 to account for internal capture to/from casino.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

It is estimated that approximately 30 percent of the project traffic would arrive at the casino from destinations north of the site, with the remaining 70 percent arriving from south of the site. For a conservative analysis, no project traffic is assumed to be generated or attracted in the immediate vicinity of the Wilfred site. The project trip distribution for Alternative A is shown in **Figures 4.8-4 and 4.8-5.**

Most of the project traffic is expected to come from US 101 and, it was assumed that most of the traffic would use Labath Avenue to enter the site because of its close proximity to the freeway. As noted in the distribution, some traffic leaving the site is expected to avoid congestion at Wilfred Avenue and Stony Point Road by using Millbrae Avenue.

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Project trips generated by the proposed project were added to the year 2008 forecasted freeway volumes. Traffic analyses were completed to evaluate the operation of the following freeway segments and ramps in the year 2008 Plus Alternative A. **Table 4.8-6** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative A freeway segment and ramp performance condition. As shown in **Table 4.8-6**, no freeway segments or ramps would operate at an unacceptable LOS with the addition of Alternative A traffic in 2008.

Figure 4.8-4

Figure 4.8-5

TABLE 4.8-6
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE
2008 - ALTERNATIVE A

US-101 Section/Ramp	Criteria LOS	2008 with Alternative A	Density (pc/mi/ln)[1]
Northbound			
US-101 South of SR-116	E	D	26.9
SR-116 Off-ramp	E	E	35.2
SR-116 On-ramp	E	E	36.5
US-101 between SR-116 and Rohnert Park Expressway (NB)	E	D	31.7
Rohnert Park Expressway NB Off-Ramp	E	D	33.9
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	C	24.5
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp	E	D	31.2
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (NB)	E	D	31.2
Wilfred Ave NB Off-Ramp	E	D	31.2
Wilfred Ave NB On-Ramp	E	D	33.6
US-101 between Wilfred Ave and Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	33.6
Santa Rosa Avenue NB Off-ramp	E	D	33.6
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	23.8
Southbound			
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	26.1
Santa Rosa Avenue On-ramp	E	//[2]	//[2]
US-101 between Santa Rosa Avenue and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	E	36.2
Wilfred Ave SB Off-Ramp	E	E	40.8
Wilfred Ave SB On-Ramp	E	E	39.4
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	E	39.4
Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp	E	E	39.4
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	35.4
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp	E	D	36.1
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and SR-116 (SB)	E	D	29.8
SR-116 SB Off-ramp	E	E	36.1
SR-116 SB On-ramp	E	E	38.3
US-101 South of SR-116 (SB)	E	D	29.0

NOTE: 1 - pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
2 - Intersection no longer exists due to planned roadway improvement.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

To evaluate the peak-hour impact of the project on study intersections, the 2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative A. **Table 4.8-7** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative A PM Peak Hour intersection conditions. The signal control is listed as TS for a signalized intersection and TWSC for a two-way stop-controlled intersection. The overall intersection LOS is reported for signalized intersections. For unsignalized intersections only the worst approach LOS is reported. Additional detail is provided in **Appendix O**.

As shown in **Table 4.8-7**, the following intersections and approaches would fail to meet acceptable level of service thresholds based on established significance criteria with the addition of project-related traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive
- Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard
- US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard
- Labath Avenue/Rohnert Park Expressway
- Rohnert Park Expressway/ Commerce Boulevard
- Millbrae Avenue/ Stony Point Road

Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Results of the analysis showed that the following intersections would satisfy traffic signal Warrant #3 by year 2008 with the addition of Alternative A traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/ Stony Point Road

2008 traffic volumes with Alternative A for study intersection are shown in **Figure 4.8-6.**

TABLE 4.8-7
INTERSECTION LOS – ALTERNATIVE A

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 with Alternative A	
				LOS	Delay[1]
1	Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
2	Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue	TWSC	D	B	13.8
3	Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue	TWSC	D	B	13.8
4	Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**51.3**
5	Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
6	Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
7	Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive	TS	D	**F**	**148.7**
8	Redwood Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	22.5
9	Wilfred Avenue/Us-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	C	27.7
10	Golf Course Drive/ Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	E	**69.4**
11	Golf Course Drive/Roberts Lake Road	TS	C	B	14.3
12	US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**F**	**103.0**
13	Project Driveway/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	A	0.0
14	Business Park Drive/Labath Avenue	-	D	B	10.6
15	Business Park Drive/Redwood Drive	TWSC	D	D	27.5
16	Rohnert Park Exp/Stony Point Road	TS	D	B	19.8
17	Rohnert Park Exp/Labath Avenue	TS	C	**D**	**43.3**
18	Rohnert Park Exp/Redwood Drive	TS	C	C	26.0
19	Rohnert Park Exp/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	B	16.2
20	Rohnert Park Exp/US-101 NB Ramps	TS	D	B	18.5
21	Rohnert Park Exp/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	**D**	**38.9**
22	Gravenstein Hwy/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	37.6
23	Gravenstein Hwy /Redwood Drive	TS	D	C	28.0
24	Gravenstein Hwy / SB US-101 Ramps	TS	D	B	17.4
25	Gravenstein Hwy /NB US-101 Off-ramp	TS	D	B	11.4
26	Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**72.0**
27	Millbrae Ave/Primrose Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.6
28	Millbrae Ave/Whistler Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
29	Millbrae Ave/Langner Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.0
30	Millbrae Ave/Labath Ave	TWSC	D	B	12.0
31	Millbrae Ave/Dowdell Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.4
NOTE: 1Delay in seconds. SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.					

Figure 4.8-6

Mitigation Measures

As shown in the peak-hour intersection performance, Alternative A would have a significant impact on intersections. Mitigation measures for the 2008 plus project PM traffic volumes are discussed in **Section 5.2.7**. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

Potential Effects on Intersection Safety

Traffic volumes generated by Alternative A were reviewed in consideration of existing intersection collision history and the potential for increased accidents (**Appendix O**). According to collision data, the frequency of accidents involving bicyclists and pedestrians is very low. Many intersections did not report any collisions of this type during the survey period. This suggests that bicycle and pedestrian volumes are relatively low and study intersections have minimal safety hazards for individuals biking or walking. Although the project would introduce increased traffic volumes at some intersections, bicyclists and pedestrians are expected to be able to travel through study intersections with similar levels of safety. Historically, casinos and hotels do not attract a significant amount of bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The expected amount of pedestrian and bicycle traffic is nominal and a significant increase in bicycle and pedestrian accidents is unlikely.

The potential for increased collisions between motorized vehicles was also considered. Collision frequency and severity are a function of many complex factors that vary depending on the location and type of intersection or roadway segment. Factors include traffic control such as signals or stop signs, lane and shoulder widths, grades, driveway densities, roadside hazards or obstacles, presence of left and right turn lanes, sight distance, congestion, and others.

Because of the number and interrelationships of the variables, accurate crash prediction is difficult. However, the development alternatives would increase roadway congestion, a factor that could result in an increase in traffic collisions if left unmitigated. Other factors are expected to remain unaffected.

As noted previously, traffic studies have been conducted (**Appendix O**) to address the traffic and transportation effects of the development alternatives. This includes mitigation improvements to restore traffic operations to levels within acceptable standards or to levels as good as or better than without the development alternative. Any potential increases in accidents due to project-related traffic would be offset by the implementation of roadway improvements included as mitigation. Therefore, if mitigation measures are implemented as proposed in **Section 5.2.7**, no significant increase in daytime or nighttime collisions would occur.

LAND USE

The approximately 252-acre Wilfred site is bordered by residences, farmland, a dairy, light industrial land uses, a business park and the Laguna de Santa Rosa to the south. As described in **Section 3.8, Resource Use Patterns** and shown in **Figure 3.8-9**, existing development in the immediate vicinity of the Wilfred site includes, large retail stores (including WalMart, Home Depot, Costco, and Target), a movie theatre, a miniature golf course with batting cages, gas stations, a mobile home park, multi-family residential, and multiple commercial and industrial developments. The casino/hotel resort would be developed adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Rohnert Park and within the City's sphere of influence. Development is planned on approximately 66 acres in the northeast corner of the Wilfred site; the remainder of the site would remain undeveloped and be used for open space, pasture, biological habitat, and recycled water sprayfields. A large portion of the project site is currently located within unincorporated Sonoma County; however, under Alternative A the project site would be taken into federal trust and local land use plans or policies would no longer apply to the project site (**Figure 3.8-12**). Furthermore, most development under Alternative A would be located within an area planned by the City of Rohnert Park for commercial/industrial/residential development (Northwest Specific Plan). Although the Northwest Specific Plan does not contemplate the development of a Class III casino, neither does any specific land use designation in California, since such developments are not legal on non-Indian lands. Thus, although most of the area proposed for development under Alternative A is currently planned for development, Alternative A would technically be inconsistent with local land use plans. Alternative A would not result in any significant environmental impacts to land uses, however, such as land use conflicts. Examples of land use conflicts would include an obstruction of access or the preclusion of allowable uses. Note that treated wastewater would flow off-site for a short distance along existing drainage channels and through an existing 54-inch culvert should a seasonal surface water discharge be utilized for treated wastewater disposal (see **Section 2.2.7**). The treated wastewater flow is less than one percent of the flow capacity of the 54-inch culvert (see **Appendix D**). Thus, land use conflicts from exceeding capacity of the culverts (such as overflow or erosion) would not occur. Therefore, a less-than-significant land use effect would result.

In addition, unlike the Stony Point site alternatives, although Alternative A development is located within a community separator as designated by the County Open Space Element, this area has been planned for development by the City of Rohnert Park, and would not be maintained as open space should Alternative A not be developed. Alternative A would be developed away from the only concentrated residential development in the area (the mobile home park) as are the other alternatives. Also like the other alternatives, the southern 182 acres of the Wilfred site would be retained in open space under Alternative A. As summarized in **Section 2.2.10**, the Tribe has agreed in an MOU with the City of Rohnert Park in an MOU to make contributions up to $2,700,000 towards the purchase of open space. The Tribe also agreed in the Rohnert Park MOU to contribute $2,664,000 to the City of Rohnert Park. All or a portion of these funds could be

used for the purchase or preservation of open space. Thus, Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on regional open space.

AGRICULTURE

The development of Alternative A would result in the direct conversion of up to 81.7-acres of rural lands to urban uses that are located on the northeastern portion of the Wilfred site. This land is currently unirrigated and not in agricultural production. According to the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), the land proposed for development under each option of Alternative A does not consist of prime and unique farmland or farmland of statewide and local importance (**Appendix P**).

As discussed in **Section 3.8.3**, the California Land Conservation Act (LCA) of 1965, also known as the Williamson Act (CGC §51200 *et. seq*.), is designed to preserve agricultural and open space lands by discouraging their premature and unnecessary conversion to urban uses. Four parcels totaling 181.71 acres in the southern portion of the Wilfred site are under Williamson Act contracts (**Figure 3.8-17**)**.** These parcels are partially irrigated and currently used as pasturelands. Removing property from the Williamson Act requires an application for non-renewal to be filed. To date, no application for non-renewal has been submitted for any of the parcels within the Wilfred site. Under Alternative A, Option 2 and Option 3 for wastewater disposal involves the use of the eastern Williamson Act parcel as a sprayfield. This action would serve as an irrigation source for the parcel and would not require removing the land from agricultural use. In addition, Option 2 and Option 3 of Alternative A would include the development of a seasonal water storage pond on the northeastern corner of the eastern Williamson Act Parcel (**Figure 2-6** and **Figure 2-7** respectively). This development would be considered an allowable use under the Williamson Act as it would aid in irrigation of the land and the primary use of the parcel would remain agricultural. In accordance with Section 3.1(b) of the MOU between the Tribe and Sonoma County (**Appendix E** of the DEIS), the Tribe shall enter into a binding and enforceable agreement with the County "regarding any loss of open space, community separator, and Williamson Act issues." Based on this provision, it is expected that the Intergovernmental Agreement to be negotiated between the County and the Tribe pursuant to the MOU will provide the County with an enforceable right to provide that the land is used in a manner consistent with the terms of the Williamson Act contract.

The area proposed for the development of the casino and hotel complex is located adjacent to agricultural operations. Proximity to agricultural operations could result in potential impacts associated with noise from farm equipment, dust, irrigation overspray, and other effects. However, parking areas and proposed roadways would provide a minimum buffer of 300 feet between adjacent agricultural fields and outdoor activity areas, including the pool area. This buffer meets the minimum width requirements of the Sonoma County Right-to-Farm Ordinance, and accordingly would be sufficient to insure that adjacent agricultural operations would not

result in significant conflicts with the proposed development and would minimize the likelihood that the Tribe would seek to curtail nearby agricultural activities due to nuisance concerns. Furthermore, the Sonoma County Right-to-Farm Ordinance will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the project site.

Given that the proposed developments are compatible with the agricultural use of the southern Williamson Act parcels and adjacent agricultural lands, and no conversion of important farmland would occur, Alterative A would have a less-than-significant impact on agriculture.

4.8.3 ALTERNATIVE B – NORTHWEST STONY POINT CASINO

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This subsection discusses the build-out traffic conditions with the project trips calculated for Alternative B added to the baseline condition**.**

Site Access

The main project access is from the south side of Wilfred Avenue, where an existing driveway aligns with Primrose Avenue. This approach would operate as a full movement driveway with no turn limitations. A second project access is from Stony Point Road, located approximately 880 feet south of the Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue intersection. This location is at an existing driveway access; however, due to conflicts with the northbound turn bay at the Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue intersection, the access would be limited to right in/out operation. Currently, neither access is signalized or stop sign controlled.

Construction Impacts

It is estimated that 150,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required to develop the site for Alternative B. It is expected that construction would involve 150,000 cubic yards of fill that would be taken from an on-site location separated from the development area which would generate traffic on the surrounding roadways. The on-site separated location is the southern portion of the Stony Point site where truck traffic would travel on an approximately 5 mile loop from Rohnert Park Expressway to Stony Point Road to Wilfred Avenue to Redwood and back to Rohnert Park Expressway. Trucks would leave/enter the on-site fill location at the Rohnert Park Expressway driveway just east of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel. The trucks would leave/enter the development area at the Stony Point Road/Project Driveway intersection. Assuming that the trips were spread out over a period of 4 months, with trucks operating at 6 days per week, 10 hours per day, this would result in 131 trucks making 262 trip ends on an average day with 13 trucks making 26 trip ends in any given hour (including potentially the peak hour) on the 5 mile loop.

Once the site is graded, the project would also require the importation of construction material including, raw materials, the building pad, concrete, the parking lot base and asphalt paving. This results in a material importation of 3,000 to 4,000 truckloads of material which would occur over approximately 23 months. The importation will require approximately 8 to 9 truck trips per day outside of the off-site fill delivery. Each truck will generate 1 inbound and 1 outbound trip, accounting for 2 trips. Therefore, during the peak construction period the project would generate about 18 truck trips ends per day.

Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less traffic than the project's equivalent passenger car traffic generation (even when added to employee trips) and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it should not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection. The construction traffic impact would represent a temporary and less-than-significant inconvenience to travelers on affected roadways and area residents. However, this level of truck traffic may have an impact on quality of life including increased noise, visual impact, and a perception of lower traffic safety. Tracking of debris and mud onto roadways may create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction.

Project Trip Generation

As summarized in **Table 4.8-8**, Alternative B would generate 1,384 new trips to the circulation network in the AM and 2,287 new trips in the PM peak hour. Since Alternatives A, B, and C are all proposed casinos with the same amount of gaming space and hotel space, trip generation numbers are the same for all three alternatives. Although project trip generation was prepared for both the AM and PM peak hours, only the PM peak hour was evaluated in the traffic study as it represents the time period for which the project would contribute to the greatest amount of congestion and potential for mitigation. As such, the weekday PM peak hour is used to evaluate potential impacts from the project. **Figure 4.8-7** shows the project-generated PM traffic volumes for Alternative B.

TABLE 4.8-8
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE B

Land Use	Trips						
	Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Entering	Exiting	Total	Entering	Exiting	Total
Casino & Entertainment 450,000 sf[1]	17,744	930	398	1,328	1,181	1,047	2,228
Hotel & Spa 300 room[2]	817	34	22	56	31	28	59
Net New Vehicle Trips	*18,261*	*964*	*420*	*1,384*	*1,212*	*1,075*	*2,287*

NOTES: [1] sf = square foot
[2] Trip rate is ITE Land Use Code 310 – Hotel. Rate reduced by 2/3 to account for internal capture to/from casino.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

Figure 4.8-7

Sometimes developments also attract trips that are already on the road and stop as they pass by the site. These are not new vehicle trips, but are considered to be pass-by trips. Although it is likely that some trips to the site would be pass-by trips, no empirical data was readily available to determine a reasonable pass-by rate. Therefore, pass-by trips are conservatively not assumed in the Alternative B analysis.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

It is estimated that approximately 30 percent of the project traffic would be distributed to destinations north of the site, with the remaining 70 percent distributed south of the site. For a conservative analysis, no project traffic is assumed to be generated or attracted in the immediate vicinity of the Wilfred site. The project traffic distribution for Alternative B is shown in **Figures 4.8-8** and **4.8-9**.

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Project trips generated by the proposed casino and hotel were added to the year 2008 forecast freeway volumes. **Table 4.8-9** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative B freeway segment and ramp performance condition. As shown in **Table 4.8-9**, the following freeway segments and ramps would operate unacceptably in 2008 after the addition of Alternative B traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue SB On-Ramp
- US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Avenue (SB)
- Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

To evaluate the peak hour impact of the project on study intersections 2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative B.

Table 4.8-10 summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative B Peak Hour intersection conditions. The signal control is listed as TS for a signalized intersection and TWSC for a two-way stop-controlled intersection. Additional detail is provided in **Appendix O**. The following intersections and approaches would fail to meet acceptable LOS thresholds based on established significance criteria and with the addition of project-related traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive
- Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue

Figure 4.8-8

Figure 4.8-9

- Wilfred Avenue/ Langner Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue /Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue /Dowdell Avenue
- Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard
- Rohnert Park Expressway/Labath Avenue
- Commerce Boulevard/US-101 NB Ramps
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard

TABLE 4.8-9
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE
2008 - ALTERNATIVE B

US-101 Section/Ramp	Criteria LOS	2008 with Alternative B	Density (pc/mi/ln) [1]
Northbound			
US-101 South of SR_116	E	C	25.1
SR-116 Off-ramp	E	D	33.7
SR-116 On-ramp	E	E	35.2
US-101 between SR-116 and Rohnert Park Expressway (NB)	E	D	28.8
Rohnert Park Expressway NB Off-Ramp	E	D	34.2
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	C	21.8
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp	E	D	29.1
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (NB)	E	D	29.1
Wilfred Ave NB Off-Ramp	E	D	29.1
Wilfred Ave NB On-Ramp	E	D	33.9
US-101 between Wilfred Ave and Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	33.9
Santa Rosa Avenue NB Off-ramp	E	D	33.9
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	23.8
Southbound			
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	26.1
Santa Rosa Avenue On-ramp	E	//[2]	//[2]
US-101 between Santa Rosa Avenue and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	E	39.3
Wilfred Ave SB Off-Ramp	E	E	40.8
Wilfred Ave SB On-Ramp	E	**F**	**45.0**
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	**F**	**45.0**
Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp	E	**F**	**45.0**
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	34.5
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp	E	D	34.1
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and SR-116 (SB)	E	D	27.1
SR-116 SB Off-ramp	E	D	34.0
SR-116 SB On-ramp	E	E	37.2
US-101 South of SR-116	E	D	27.4

NOTE: [1]pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
[2]Intersection no longer exists due to planned roadway improvement.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

TABLE 4.8-10
INTERSECTION LOS – ALTERNATIVE B

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 with Alternative B	
				LOS	Delay[1]
1	Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
2	Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
3	Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**86.6**
4	Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**82.9**
5	Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
6	Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
7	Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive	TS	D	**F**	**344.5**
8	Redwood Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	22.8
9	Wilfred Avenue/ US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	D	52.2
10	Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**F**	**135.1**
11	Golf Course Drive/Roberts Lake Road	TS	C	B	14.5
12	US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**F**	**96.1**
13	Project Driveway/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	D	27.6
14	Business Park Drive/Labath Avenue	-	D	*/*[2]	*/*[2]
15	Business Park Drive/Redwood Drive	TWSC	D	D	27.5
16	Rohnert Park Expressway/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	43.0
17	Rohnert Park Expressway/Labath Avenue	TS	C	**D**	**39.5**
18	Rohnert Park Expressway/Redwood Drive	TS	C	C	26.1
19	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	B	16.7
20	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 NB Ramps	TS	D	C	21.3
21	Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	**D**	**38.1**
22	Gravenstein Hwy/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	44.0
23	Gravenstein Hwy /Redwood Drive	TS	D	C	28.1
24	Gravenstein Hwy / SB US-101 Ramps	TS	D	C	20.4
25	Gravenstein Hwy /NB US-101 Off-ramp	TS	D	B	12.8
26	Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**69.0**
27	Millbrae Ave/Primrose Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
28	Millbrae Ave/Whistler Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
29	Millbrae Ave/Langner Ave	TWSC	D	A	9.9
30	Millbrae Ave/Labath Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
31	Millbrae Ave/Dowdell Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.4

NOTE: 1Delay in seconds.
2Intersection only exists under Alternative A with project.
Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

Results of the analysis showed that the following intersections would satisfy traffic signal Warrant #3 by year 2008:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue
- Project Driveway/Stony Point Road
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

The Alternative B 2008 traffic volumes for each study intersection are shown in **Figure 4.8-10.**

These local traffic improvements would reduce the project impact at the Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue, Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue, Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue, and Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive intersections. Improvements to project impacts would also occur at the Rohnert Park Expressway intersections, including the Rohnert Park Expressway/Rancho Verde Mobile Home Park access.

Mitigation Measures

As shown above, Alternative B would have a significant impact on intersections and freeway segments and ramps. Mitigation measures for the 2008 plus project PM traffic volumes are discussed in **Section 5.2.7**. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures a significant impact would remain for two study intersections.

Potential Effects on Intersection Safety

Potential effects on intersection safety are not expected to differ substantially from Alternative A. Therefore, if mitigation measures are implemented as proposed in **Section 5.2.7**, no significant increase in daytime or nighttime collisions would occur for Alternative B.

LAND USE

Land uses surrounding the Stony Point site include rural residences to the north and northeast; commercial areas, a business park and mobile home next to open space to the east; Laguna de Santa Rosa to the south, and agriculture uses to the west. Alternative B would result in the development of a casino/hotel resort on a site that was largely undeveloped, not planned for development, and in a community separator. This development would not, however result in any conflicts with surrounding land uses, such as denial of access or preclusion of allowable uses. As with Alternative A, the project site is currently located within unincorporated Sonoma County; however, under Alternative B the project site would be taken into trust and local land use plans or policies would no longer apply to the project site.

Figure 4.8-10

Note that treated wastewater would flow off-site for a short distance along existing drainage channels and through an existing 54-inch culvert should a seasonal surface water discharge be utilized for treated wastewater disposal (see **Section 2.3.7**). The treated wastewater flow is less than one percent of the flow capacity of the 54-inch culvert (see **Appendix D**). Thus, land use conflicts from exceeding capacity of the culverts (such as overflow or erosion) would not occur. In addition, Alternative B would be developed away from the only concentrated residential development in the surrounding areas (mobile home park) as is the case for the other alternatives. There would be no significant land use conflicts would occur.

The casino/hotel resort would be developed in an area designated as a "community separator" by local planning regulations. This would result in a local loss of open space. As summarized in **Section 2.2.10**, the Tribe has agreed in an MOU with the City of Rohnert Park to make contributions up to $2,700,000 towards the purchase of open space. The Tribe also agreed in the Rohnert Park MOU to contribute $2,664,000 to the City of Rohnert Park. All or a portion of these funds could be used for the purchase or preservation of open space.

In anticipation of development of Alternative B on the Stony Point site, the Tribe permitted the landowners of approximately 1,679 acres of open space along the San Pablo Bay in Southern Sonoma County to negotiate a land purchase agreement with the Sonoma Land Trust by relinquishing their rights to the land under an exclusive option agreement. In addition, the Tribe contributed $75,000 to the Sonoma Land Trust to launch its capital campaign to raise funds for the purchase. The Tribe also plans to keep the southern 182 acres of the Stony Point site as open space. Finally, the Stony Point site represents only a portion of open space present in the area. Rural residential or agricultural lands are currently present on all sides of the Stony Point site except for lands to the southeast. The impact on regional open space on Alternative B would be less than significant.

AGRICULTURE

Alternative B proposes the development of a casino and hotel complex on the northwest portion of the Stony Point site. This portion of the site is currently used as unirrigated pasturelands. Two options exist for wastewater treatment and disposal that could potentially have different impacts to agricultural resources. The development of Alternative B Option 1 (**Figure 2-12**), would directly convert 74.4 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 32.2 acres (of the 74.4 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland and 2.7 acres are considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 74.4 acres represent approximately 0.0056 percent of the farmland in the County. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that crop growth on the land is limited to a small number of crops and requires special management. The site assessment rating has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) point total for Alternative B, Option 1 is 105

out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**).

The development of Alternative B, Option 2 (**Figure 2-13**) would directly convert 89.1 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 46 acres (of the 89.1 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland and 2.7 acres are considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 89.1 acres represent approximately 0.0078 percent of the farmland in the County. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 39, which indicates that crop growth on the land is severely limited and requires special management. The site assessment rating has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total for Alternative B, Option 1 is 103 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**).

Four parcels totaling 181.71 acres in the southern portion of the Stony Point site are under Williamson Act Contracts. Removing property from the Williamson Act requires an application for non-renewal to be filed. To date, no application for non-renewal has been submitted for any of the parcels within the Stony Point site. Under Alternative B, wastewater disposal Option 2 involves the use of the eastern Williamson Act parcel as a sprayfield. This action would serve as an irrigation source for the parcel and would not require removing the land from agricultural use.

The area proposed for development of the casino and hotel complex is located adjacent to agricultural operations. Since the development would take place on trust land, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance, which requires that properly conducted agricultural operations shall not be considered a nuisance to the proposed development, would not apply. Proposed parking areas and roadways would function as buffers between agricultural operations and outdoor activity areas, thereby reducing the potential for conflicts to occur. These buffers meet the minimum width requirements specified in the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance, and accordingly would be sufficient to insure that adjacent agricultural operations would not result in signification conflicts with the proposed development and would minimize the likelihood that the Tribe would seek to curtain nearby agricultural activities due to nuisance concerns. Furthermore, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the project site.

Given the inferior quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the combined FPPA score of no more than 105, the retention of the southern Williamson Act parcels for agricultural purposes, and the avoidance of land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, Alternative B would have a less-than-significant impact on agriculture.

4.8.4 ALTERNATIVE C – NORTHEAST STONY POINT CASINO

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

This subsection discusses the build-out traffic conditions with the project trips calculated for Alternative C added to the baseline condition.

Site Access

The sole project access is from Wilfred Avenue from the south leg of Whistler Avenue. This approach is assumed to operate as a full movement intersection with no turn limitations. Currently, the access is unsignalized.

Construction Impacts

It is estimated that 350,000 cubic yards of earthwork will be required to develop the site for Alternative C. It is expected that construction will involve 350,000 cubic yards of fill that would be taken from an on-site location separated from the development area which would generate traffic on the surrounding roadways. The on-site separated location is the southern portion of the Wilfred site where truck traffic will travel on an approximately 5 mile loop from Rohnert Park Expressway to Stony Point Road to Wilfred Avenue to Redwood and back to Rohnert Park Expressway. Trucks would leave/enter the on-site fill location at the Rohnert Park Expressway driveway just east of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel. The trucks would leave/enter the development area at the Wilfred/Whistler intersection. Assuming that the trips were spread out over a period of 5 months, with trucks operating at 6 days per week, 10 hours per day, this would result in 243 trucks making 486 trip ends on an average day with 25 trucks making 50 trip ends in any given hour (including potentially the peak hour) on the 5 mile loop.

Once the site is graded, the project will also require the importation of construction material including, raw materials, the building pad, concrete, the parking lot base and asphalt paving. This results in a material importation of 3,000 to 4,000 truckloads of material which will occur over approximately 23 months. The importation will require approximately 8 to 9 truck trips per day outside of the off-site fill delivery. Each truck will generate 1 inbound and 1 outbound trip, accounting for 2 trips. Therefore, during the peak construction period the project will generate about 18 truck trips ends per day.

Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less traffic than the project's equivalent passenger car traffic generation (even when added to employee trips) and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it should not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection. The construction traffic impact would represent a temporary and less-than-significant inconvenience to travelers on affected roadways and area residents. However, this level of truck traffic may have an impact on quality of life including increased noise, visual impact, and a perception of lower traffic safety. Tracking of debris and mud onto

roadways may create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction.

Project Trip Generation

As summarized in **Table 4.8-11**, Alternative C would generate 1,384 new trips to the circulation network in the AM and 2,287 new trips in the PM peak hour. Since Alternatives A, B and C are all proposed casinos with the same amount of gaming space and hotel space, trip generation numbers are the same for all three alternatives. Although project trip generation was prepared for both the AM and PM peak hours, only the PM peak hour was evaluated in the traffic study as it represents the time period for which the project would contribute to the greatest amount of congestion and potential for mitigation. As such, the weekday PM peak hour is used to evaluate potential impacts from the project. **Figure 4.8-11** shows the project-generated PM traffic volumes for Alternative C.

Sometimes developments also attract trips that are already on the road and stop as they pass by the site. These are not new vehicle trips but are considered to be pass-by trips. Although it is likely that some trips to the site would be pass-by trips, no empirical data was readily available to determine a reasonable pass-by rate. Therefore, pass-by trips are conservatively not assumed in the Alternative C analysis.

TABLE 4.8-11
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE C

Land Use	Trips						
	Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Entering	Exiting	Total	Entering	Exiting	Total
Casino & Entertainment 450,000 sf[1]	17,744	930	398	1,328	1,181	1,047	2,228
Hotel & Spa 300 room[2]	817	34	22	56	31	28	59
Net New Vehicle Trips	*18,261*	*964*	*420*	*1,384*	*1,212*	*1,075*	*2,287*

NOTES: 1 sf = square foot
2 Trip rate is ITE Land Use Code 310 – Hotel. Rate reduced by 2/3 to account for internal capture to/from casino.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

It is estimated that approximately 30 percent of the project traffic would be distributed to destinations north of the site, with the remaining 70 percent distributed south of the site. For a conservative analysis, no project traffic is assumed to be generated or attracted in the immediate

Figure 4.8-11

Figure 4.8-12

vicinity of the Wilfred site. The project traffic distribution for Alternative C is shown in **Figures 4.8-12** and **4.8-13**.

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Project trips generated by the proposed casino and hotel were added to the year 2008 forecast freeway volumes. Traffic analyses were completed to evaluate the operation of the following freeway segments and ramps in the year 2008 Plus Alternative C. Freeway segment analyses were limited to the mix-use travel lanes, which are expected to have significantly more congestion than the future HOV lanes.

Table 4.8-12 summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative C freeway segment and ramp performance condition. As shown in **Table 4.8-12**, the following freeway segments and ramps would operate unacceptably in 2008 after the addition of Alternative C traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue SB On-Ramp
- US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Avenue (SB)
- Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

The 2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative C. **Table 4.8-13** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative C Peak Hour intersection conditions. Signal controls are listed as TS for a signalized intersection and TWSC for a two-way stop-controlled intersection. Additional detail is provided in **Appendix O**. The following intersections would fail to meet acceptable level of service thresholds based on established significance criteria and with the addition of project-related traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive
- Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard
- US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard
- Rohnert Park Expressway/ Commerce Boulevard

Figure 4.8-13

TABLE 4.8-12
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE
2008 - ALTERNATIVE C

US-101 Section/Ramp	Criteria LOS	2008 with Alternative C	Density (pc/mi/ln)[1]
Northbound			
US-101 South of SR-116	E	C	25.1
SR-116 Off-ramp	E	D	31.8
SR-116 On-ramp	E	D	33.4
US-101 between SR-116 and Rohnert Park Expressway (NB)	E	D	28.8
Rohnert Park Expressway NB Off-Ramp	E	D	32.5
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	31.4
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp	E	D	30.4
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (NB)	E	D	30.4
Wilfred Ave NB Off-Ramp	E	D	30.4
Wilfred Ave NB On-Ramp	E	D	33.9
US-101 between Wilfred Ave and Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	33.9
Santa Rosa Avenue NB Off-ramp	E	D	33.9
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	23.8
Southbound			
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	26.1
Santa Rosa Avenue On-ramp	E	*//*[2]	*//*[2]
US-101 between Santa Rosa Avenue and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	E	36.2
Wilfred Ave SB Off-Ramp	E	E	40.8
Wilfred Ave SB On-Ramp	E	**F**	**46.6**
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	**F**	**46.6**
Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp	E	**F**	**46.6**
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	33.4
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp	E	D	32.8
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and SR-116 (SB)	E	D	27.1
SR-116 SB Off-ramp	E	D	32.5
SR-116 SB On-ramp	E	E	35.7
US-101 South of SR-116	E	D	27.4

NOTE: 1 - pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
2 - Intersection no longer exists due to planned roadway improvement.
Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

TABLE 4.8-13
INTERSECTION LOS – ALTERNATIVE C

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 with Alternative C	
				LOS	Delay[1]
1	Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
2	Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue	TWSC	D	C	24.7
3	Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
4	Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**132.1**
5	Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
6	Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
7	Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive	TS	D	**F**	**3334.5**
8	Redwood Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	24.9
9	Wilfred Avenue/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	C	33.8
10	Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**F**	**116.7**
11	Golf Course Drive/Roberts Lake Road	TS	C	B	18.5
12	US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**F**	**83.8**
13	Project Driveway/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	A	0.0
14	Business Park Drive/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	/[2]	/[2]
15	Business Park Drive/Redwood Drive	TWSC	D	D	27.5
16	Rohnert Park Expressway/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	39.8
17	Rohnert Park Expressway/Labath Avenue	TS	C	C	29.6
18	Rohnert Park Expressway/Redwood Drive	TS	C	C	24.9
19	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	B	16.5
20	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 NB Ramps	TS	D	B	13.6
21	Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	**D**	**43.0**
22	SR-116/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	43.0
23	SR-116/Redwood Drive	TS	D	C	28.3
24	SR-116/SB US-101 Ramps	TS	D	B	19.3
25	SR-116/NB US-101 Off-ramp	TS	D	B	12.1
26	Millbrae Ave/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**69.6**
27	Millbrae Ave/Primrose Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
28	Millbrae Ave/Whistler Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.6
29	Millbrae Ave/Langner Ave	TWSC	D	A	9.9
30	Millbrae Ave/Labath Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
31	Millbrae Ave/Dowdell Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.4

NOTE: 1 - pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
2 - Intersection only exists under Alternative A with project.
Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

Figure 4.8-14

The Alternative C 2008 PM peak traffic volumes for each study intersection are shown in **Figure 4.8-14.**

Results of the analysis showed that the following intersections would satisfy traffic signal Warrant #3 by year 2008:

- Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue
- Whistler Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Labath Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Dowdell Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

Mitigation Measures

As shown above, Alternative C would have a significant impact on intersections and freeway segments and ramps. Mitigation measures for Alternative C are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. After the incorporation of project mitigation measures, a significant impact would remain at one study intersection.

Potential Effects on Intersection Safety

Potential effects on intersection safety are not expected to differ substantially from Alternative A. Therefore, if mitigation measures are implemented as proposed in **Section 5.2.7**, no significant increase in daytime or nighttime collisions would occur.

LAND USE

Alternative C's effects on land use would be similar to Alternative B, since the development would be similar in size and scope to Alternative B, and would occur in the northern portion of the Stony Point site. Moreover, under Alternative C the project site would be taken into trust and local land use plans or policies would no longer apply to the project site. As with Alternative B, a less-than-significant land use effect would result. The effects on open space are similar to those of Alternative B and would remain less than significant, although Alternative C's development footprint would be slightly larger than the footprint for Alternative B.

AGRICULTURE

Alternative C proposes the development of a casino and hotel complex on the northeast portion of the Stony Point site. This portion of the site is currently used as unirrigated pasturelands. As with Alternative B, two options exist for wastewater treatment and disposal that could potentially have different impacts to agricultural resources. The development of Alternative C, Option 1 (**Figure 2-17**), would directly convert 80.9 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 75 acres (of the 80.9 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland while none of the

land to be converted is considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 80.9 acres represent approximately 0.012 percent of the farmland in the County. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that crop growth on the land is limited to a small number of crops and requires special management. The site assessment rating of the Stony Point site has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total for Alternative C, Option 1 is 105 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**).

The development of Alternative C, Option 2 (**Figure 2-18**), would directly convert 96.6 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 72.8 acres (of the 96.6 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland and 2.9 acres are considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 96.6 acres represents approximately 0.012 percent of the farmland in the County. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 39, which indicates that crop growth on the land is severely limited and requires special management. The site assessment rating has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total for Alternative C, Option 2 is 103 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**).

As mentioned under Alternative B, the four parcels in the southern portion of the Stony Point site are under Williamson Act Contracts. To date, no application for non-renewal of the contracts has been submitted for any of the parcels within the Stony Point site. Under Alternative C, Option 2 for wastewater disposal involves the use of the eastern William Act parcel as a sprayfield. This action would serve as an irrigation source for the parcel and would not require removing the land from agricultural use.

As with Alternative B, the area proposed for development of the casino and hotel complex is located adjacent to agricultural operations. Since the development would take place on trust land, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance, which requires that properly conducted agricultural operations shall not be considered a nuisance to the proposed development, would not apply. Proposed parking areas and roadways would function as buffers between agricultural operations and outdoor activity areas, thereby reducing the potential for conflicts to occur. These buffers meet the minimum width requirements specified in the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance, and accordingly would be sufficient to insure that adjacent agricultural operations would not result in signification conflicts with the proposed development and would minimize the likelihood that the Tribe would seek to curtain nearby agricultural activities due to nuisance concerns. Furthermore, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the project site.

Given the inferior quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the combined FPPA score of no more than 101, the retention of the southern Williamson Act parcels for

agricultural purposes, and the avoidance of land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, Alternative C would have a less-than-significant impact on agriculture.

4.8.5 ALTERNATIVE D – REDUCED INTENSITY (STONY POINT SITE)

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This subsection discusses the build-out traffic conditions with the project trips calculated for Alternative D added to the baseline condition.

Site Access

The site access for this alternative is the same as for Alternative B.

Construction Impacts

It is estimated that 150,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required to develop the site for Alternative D. It is expected that construction would involve 150,000 cubic yards of fill that would be taken from an on-site location separated from the development area which would generate traffic on the surrounding roadways. The on-site separated location is the southern portion of the Stony Point site where truck traffic will travel on an approximately 5 mile loop from Rohnert Park Expressway to Stony Point Road to Wilfred Avenue to Redwood and back to Rohnert Park Expressway. Trucks would leave/enter the on-site fill location at the Rohnert Park Expressway driveway just east of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel. The trucks would leave/enter the development area at the Stony Point Road/Project Driveway intersection. Assuming that the trips were spread out over a period of 4 months, with trucks operating at 6 days per week, 10 hours per day, this would result in 131 trucks making 262 trip ends on an average day with 13 trucks making 26 trip ends in any given hour (including potentially the peak hour) on the 5 mile loop.

Once the site is graded, the project would also require the importation of construction material including, raw materials, the building pad, concrete, the parking lot base and asphalt paving. This results in a material importation of 3,000 to 4,000 truckloads of material which would occur over approximately 23 months. The importation would require approximately 8 to 9 truck trips per day outside of the off-site fill delivery. Each truck would generate 1 inbound and 1 outbound trip, accounting for 2 trips. Therefore, during the peak construction period the project would generate about 18 truck trips ends per day.

Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less traffic than the project's equivalent passenger car traffic generation (even when added to employee trips) and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it should not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection. The construction traffic impact would represent a temporary and less-than-significant inconvenience to travelers on affected roadways and area residents.

However, this level of truck traffic may have an impact on quality of life including increased noise, visual impact, and a perception of lower traffic safety. Tracking of debris and mud onto roadways may create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction.

Project Trip Generation

As summarized in **Table 4.8-14,** Alternative D would generate 949 new trips to the circulation network in the AM peak hour and 1,580 new trips in the PM peak hour. Although project trip generation was prepared for both the AM and PM peak hours, only the PM peak hour was evaluated in the traffic study as it represents the time period for which the project would contribute to the greatest amount of congestion and potential mitigation. In addition, only PM peak hour future year traffic forecast data was available from the City of Rohnert Park to complete a cumulative analysis.

TABLE 4.8-14
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE D

Land Use	Trips						
	Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Entering	Exiting	Total	Entering	Exiting	Total
Casino & Entertainment 315,100 square feet	12,424	651	279	930	827	733	1,560
Hotel 100 room[1]	272	12	7	19	11	9	20
Net New Vehicle Trips	*12,696*	*663*	*286*	*949*	*838*	*742*	*1,580*

NOTE: 1 Trip rate is ITE Land Use Code 310 – Hotel. Rate reduced by 2/3 to account for internal capture to/from casino.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

Sometimes developments also attract trips that are already on the road and stop as they pass by the site. These are not new vehicle trips but are considered to be pass-by trips. Although it is likely that some trips to the site would be pass-by trips, no empirical data was readily available to determine a reasonable pass-by rate. Therefore, pass-by trips are conservatively not assumed in the Alternative D analysis.

Figure 4.8-15 shows the project-generated PM traffic volumes as for Alternative D.

Figure 4.8-15

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

The project trip distribution and assignment for this alternative is the same as Alternative B. The project traffic distribution is shown in **Figures 4.8-16** and **4.8-17**.

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Table 4.8-15 summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative D freeway segment and ramp performance condition. Under 2008 with Alternative D conditions, the following freeway segments and ramps are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

- Wilfred Ave. SB On-Ramp
- US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave. (SB)
- Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

- The 2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative D. **Table 4.8-16** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative D Peak Hour intersection conditions. Signal controls are listed as TS for a signalized intersection and TWSC for a two-way stop-controlled intersection. Additional detail is provided in **Appendix O**.

As shown in the results, the following intersections will fail to meet acceptable level of service thresholds based on established significance criteria and with the addition of project-related traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive
- Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard
- Commerce Boulevard/US-101 NB Ramps
- Rohnert Park Expressway/ Commerce Boulevard

Figure 4.8-16

Figure 4.8-17

TABLE 4.8-15
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE
2008 - ALTERNATIVE D

US-101 Section/Ramp	Criteria LOS	2008 with Alternative D	Density (pc/mi/ln)[1]
Northbound			
US-101 South of SR_116	E	C	23.1
SR-116 Off-ramp	E	D	31.8
SR-116 On-ramp	E	D	33.4
US-101 between SR-116 and Rohnert Park Expressway (NB)	E	D	27.0
Rohnert Park Expressway NB Off-Ramp	E	D	32.5
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	31.4
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp	E	C	26.8
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (NB)	E	C	26.8
Wilfred Ave NB Off-Ramp	E	C	26.8
Wilfred Ave NB On-Ramp	E	D	32.8
US-101 between Wilfred Ave and Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	32.8
Santa Rosa Avenue NB Off-ramp	E	D	32.8
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	23.2
Southbound			
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	25.5
Santa Rosa Avenue On-ramp	E	// [2]	// [2]
US-101 between Santa Rosa Avenue and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	D	31.0
Wilfred Ave SB Off-Ramp	E	E	40.2
Wilfred Ave SB On-Ramp	E	**F**	**43.3**
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	**F**	**43.3**
Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp	E	**F**	**43.3**
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	33.4
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp	E	D	32.8
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and SR-116 (SB)	E	C	25.5
SR-116 SB Off-ramp	E	D	32.5
SR-116 SB On-ramp	E	E	35.7
US-101 South of SR-116	E	D	25.5

NOTE: 1- pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
2 -Intersection no longer exists due to planned roadway improvement.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

TABLE 4.8-16
INTERSECTION LOS – ALTERNATIVE D

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 with Alternative D	
				LOS	Delay[1]
1	Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
2	Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**743.6**
3	Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue	TWSC	D	**E**	**35.5**
4	Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue	TWSC	D	**E**	**35.1**
5	Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
6	Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
7	Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive	TS	D	**F**	**206.0**
8	Redwood Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	25.0
9	Wilfred Avenue/ US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	C	25.7
10	Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	F	83.0
11	Golf Course Drive/Roberts Lake Road	TS	C	B	18.4
12	US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**E**	**61.7**
13	Project Driveway/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	C	21.8
14	Business Park Drive/Labath Avenue	-	D	/[2]	/[2]
15	Business Park Drive/Redwood Drive	TWSC	D	D	27.5
16	Rohnert Park Expressway/Stony Point Road	TS	D	C	26.1
17	Rohnert Park Expressway/Labath Avenue	TS	C	C	29.0
18	Rohnert Park Expressway/Redwood Drive	TS	C	C	25.2
19	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	B	16.6
20	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 NB Ramps	TS	D	B	17.2
21	Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	**D**	**39.9**
22	Gravenstein Hwy/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	39.6
23	Gravenstein Hwy/Redwood Drive	TS	D	C	27.4
24	Gravenstein Hwy/SB US-101 Ramps	TS	D	B	19.2
25	Gravenstein Hwy/NB US-101 Off-ramp	TS	D	B	11.7
26	Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**59.1**
27	Millbrae Ave/Primrose Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
28	Millbrae Ave/Whistler Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
29	Millbrae Ave/Langner Ave	TWSC	D	A	9.9
30	Millbrae Ave/Labath Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
31	Millbrae Ave/Dowdell Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.4

NOTE: 1Delay in seconds.
2Intersection only exists under Alternative A with project.
Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

The 2008 PM peak intersection traffic volumes with Alternative D are shown in **Figure 4.8-18.**

Results of the analysis showed that the following intersections would satisfy traffic signal Warrant #3 by year 2008:

- Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue
- Primrose Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Labath Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Dowdell Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

Mitigation Measures

As shown above, Alternative D would have a significant impact on intersections and freeway segments and ramps. Mitigation measures for Alternative D are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS.

Potential Effects on Intersection Safety

Potential effects on intersection safety are not expected to differ substantially from Alternative A. Therefore, if mitigation measures are implemented as proposed in **Section 5.2.7**, no significant increase in daytime or nighttime collisions would occur.

LAND USE

Land use effects would be similar to those of Alternative B, except at a somewhat reduced scale due to the reduced size of development for Alternative D. The project site would be taken into trust; therefore, local land use plans or policies would no longer apply. As such, a less-than-significant effect to land use would occur. The terms of the City MOU would not apply to Alternative D. Nonetheless, a significant loss of open space would not occur given the large amount of open space that would be retained under Alternative D.

AGRICULTURE

Under Alternative D, a reduced intensity casino and hotel complex would be developed on approximately 76 acres located on the northwest portion of the Stony Point site. Alternative D's development footprint is similar to Alternative B. As with Alternative B, two options exist for wastewater treatment and disposal that could potentially have different impacts to agricultural resources. The development of Alternative D Option 1 (**Figure 2-21**), would directly convert 69.5 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 29.9 acres (of the 69.5 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland and 2.7 acres are considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 69.5 acres represent approximately 0.0052percent of the farmland in the

Figure 4.8-18

County. As with Alternative B, the NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that crop growth on the land is limited to a small number of crops and requires special management. The site assessment rating of the Stony Point site has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total for Alternative D, Option 1 is 105 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**).

The development of Alternative D Option 2 (**Figure 2-22**), would directly convert 79.6 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 40.9 acres (of the 79.6 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland and 2.7 acres are considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 79.6 acres represents approximately 0.007percent of the farmland in the County. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that crop growth on the land is limited to a small number of crops and requires special management. The site assessment rating has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total for Alternative C, Option 2 is 105 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**). As discussed under Alternative B and Alternative C, the four parcels in the southern portion of the Stony Point site are under Williamson Act Contracts. To date, no application for non-renewal of the contracts has been submitted for any of the parcels within the Stony Point site. Under Alternative D, Option 2 for wastewater disposal would also involve the use of the eastern Williamson Act parcel as a sprayfield. This action would serve as an irrigation source for the parcel and would not require removing the land from agricultural use. Proposed parking areas and roadways would function as buffers between adjacent agricultural operations and outdoor activity areas, thereby reducing the potential for conflicts to occur even though the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance would not apply. Furthermore, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the project site.

Given the inferior quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the combined FPPA score of 105, the retention of the southern Williamson Act parcels for agricultural purposes, and the avoidance of land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, Alternative C would have a less-than-significant impact on agriculture.

4.8.6 ALTERNATIVE E – BUSINESS PARK

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This subsection discusses the Build-Out traffic conditions with the project trips calculated for Alternative E added to the baseline condition

Site Access

The site access is the same as that of Alternative B.

Construction Impacts

It is estimated that 150,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required to develop the site for Alternative E. It is expected that construction would involve 150,000 cubic yards of fill that will be taken from an on-site location separated from the development area which would generate traffic on the surrounding roadways. The on-site separated location is the southern portion of the Stony Point site where truck traffic would travel on an approximately 5 mile loop from Rohnert Park Expressway to Stony Point Road to Wilfred Avenue to Redwood and back to Rohnert Park Expressway. Trucks would leave/enter the on-site fill location at the Rohnert Park Expressway driveway just east of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel. The trucks would leave/enter the development area at the Stony Point Road/Project Driveway intersection. Assuming that the trips were spread out over a period of 4 months, with trucks operating at 6 days per week, 10 hours per day, this would result in 131 trucks making 262 trip ends on an average day with 13 trucks making 26 trip ends in any given hour (including potentially the peak hour) on the 5 mile loop.

Once the site is graded, the project would also require the importation of construction material including, raw materials, the building pad, concrete, the parking lot base and asphalt paving. This results in a material importation of 3,000 to 4,000 truckloads of material which would occur over approximately 20 months. The importation would require approximately 8 to 9 truck trips per day outside of the off-site fill delivery. Each truck would generate 1 inbound and 1 outbound trip, accounting for 2 trips. Therefore, during the peak construction period the project would generate about 18 truck trips ends per day.

Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less traffic than the project's equivalent passenger car traffic generation (even when added to employee trips) and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it should not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection. The construction traffic impact would represent a temporary and less-than-significant inconvenience to travelers on affected roadways and area residents. However, this level of truck traffic may have an impact on quality of life including increased noise, visual impact, and a perception of lower traffic safety. Tracking of debris and mud onto roadways may create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction.

Project Trip Generation

As summarized in **Table 4.8-17,** Alternative E would generate 471 new trips to the circulation

TABLE 4.8-17
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE E

Land Use	Trips						
	Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Entering	Exiting	Total	Entering	Exiting	Total
Light Industrial 400,000 sf[1]	2,788	324	44	368	47	345	392
Commercial 100,000 sf[1]	4,294	63	40	103	180	195	375
Subtotal	*7,082*	*387*	*84*	*471*	*227*	*540*	*767*
Commercial Pass-By Reduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-70	-76	-146
Net New Vehicle Trips	*7,082*	*387*	*84*	*471*	*157*	*464*	*621*

NOTE: 1sf = square foot
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

network in the AM peak hour and 621 new trips in the PM peak hour. Although project trip generation was prepared for both the AM and PM peak hours, only the PM peak hour was evaluated in the traffic study as it represents the time period for which the project would contribute to the greatest amount of congestion and potential mitigation. In addition, only PM peak hour future year traffic forecast data were available from the City of Rohnert Park to complete a cumulative traffic analysis.

Developments can sometimes attract trips (vehicles) that are already on the road, to stop as they drive by the site. This type of trip is not considered a new vehicle trip, but rather a pass-by trip. A portion of the commercial trips would be attracted from Stony Point Road and Wilfred Avenue as they pass from their origin to their ultimate destination. A pass-by reduction was applied to the project trip generation to determine the net new trips expected to be produced by the industrial and commercial center. Pass-by factors were derived from the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Handbook.* Pass-by trips were applied to the commercial uses, as industrial uses typically do not generate pass-by rates.

Figure 4.8-19 shows project-generated PM volumes for Alternative E.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

The project trip distribution for this alternative shows that 30percent of the project traffic would be distributed to destinations north of the site, while 20percent would be directed to Rohnert Park area, and the remaining 50percent would be distributed south of the site. The assignment of trips on the surrounding roadway network is shown in **Figures 4.8-20** and **Figure 4.8-21**.

Figure 4.8-19

Figure 4.8-20

Figure 4.8-21

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Table 4.8-18 summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative E freeway segment and ramp performance condition. As shown in **Table 4.8-18**, no freeway segments or ramps would operate unacceptably with the addition of Alternative E traffic in 2008.

TABLE 4.8-18
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE
2008 - ALTERNATIVE E

US-101 Section/Ramp	Criteria LOS	2008 with Alternative E	Density (pc/mi/ln)[1]
Northbound			
US-101 South of SR_116	E	C	19.6
SR-116 Off-ramp	E	C	28.0
SR-116 On-ramp	E	D	30.0
US-101 between SR-116 and Rohnert Park Expressway (NB)	E	C	23.9
Rohnert Park Expressway NB Off-Ramp	E	D	29.3
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	34.0
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp	E	C	22.5
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (NB)	E	C	22.5
Wilfred Ave NB Off-Ramp	E	C	22.5
Wilfred Ave NB On-Ramp	E	D	31.9
US-101 between Wilfred Ave and Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	31.9
Santa Rosa Avenue NB Off-ramp	E	D	31.9
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	22.8
Southbound			
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	24.4
Santa Rosa Avenue On-ramp	E	//[2]	//[2]
US-101 between Santa Rosa Avenue and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	D	33.1
Wilfred Ave SB Off-Ramp	E	E	39.1
Wilfred Ave SB On-Ramp	E	E	38.5
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	E	38.5
Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp	E	E	38.5
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	32.0
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp	E	D	31.4
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and SR-116 (SB)	E	C	23.6
SR-116 SB Off-ramp	E	D	30.6
SR-116 SB On-ramp	E	D	33.7
US-101 South of SR-116	E	C	23.4

NOTE: 1pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
2Intersection no longer exists due to planned roadway improvemen
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

The 2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative E. **Table 4.8-19** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative E Peak

Hour intersection conditions. The signal control is listed as TS for a signalized intersection and TWSC for a two-way stop controlled intersection. Additional detail is provided in **Appendix O**. As shown in the results, the following intersections will fail to meet acceptable level of service thresholds based on established significance criteria and with the addition of project-related traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue /Redwood Drive
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Commerce Boulevard /US-101 NB Ramps
- Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard

Figure 4.8-22 shows the 2008 plus project PM traffic volumes at each of the study intersections for Alternative E. Results of the analysis showed that the following intersections would satisfy traffic signal Warrant #3 by year 2008:

- Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue
- Primrose Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Labath Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Dowdell Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

Mitigation Measures

As shown above, Alternative E would have a significant impact on intersections. Mitigation measures for Alternative E are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS.

Potential Effects on Intersection Safety

Potential effects on intersection safety are not expected to differ substantially from Alternative A (note that a business park is also not expected to generate substantial pedestrian and bicycle

TABLE 4.8-19
INTERSECTION LOS – ALTERNATIVE E

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 with Alternative E	
				LOS	Delay[1]
1	Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
2	Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue	TWSC	D	D	27.0
3	Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue	TWSC	D	C	16.3
4	Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue	TWSC	D	C	16.2
5	Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**541.2**
6	Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
7	Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive	TS	D	**F**	**136.1**
8	Redwood Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	25.8
9	Wilfred Avenue/ US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	C	21.6
10	Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**E**	**77.0**
11	Golf Course Drive/Roberts Lake Road	TS	C	B	18.5
12	US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	D	52.4
13	Project Driveway/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	C	17.2
14	Business Park Drive/Labath Avenue	-	D	/[2]	/[2]
15	Business Park Drive/Redwood Drive	TWSC	D	D	27.5
16	Rohnert Park Expressway/Stony Point Road	TS	D	C	27.2
17	Rohnert Park Expressway/Labath Avenue	TS	C	C	27.0
18	Rohnert Park Expressway/Redwood Drive	TS	C	C	25.7
19	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	B	16.7
20	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 NB Ramps	TS	D	B	11.5
21	Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	30.8
22	Gravenstein Hwy/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	37.4
23	Gravenstein Hwy/Redwood Drive	TS	D	C	26.7
24	Gravenstein Hwy/SB US-101 Ramps	TS	D	B	18.8
25	Gravenstein Hwy/NB US-101 Off-ramp	TS	D	B	10.9
26	Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**E**	**46.0**
27	Millbrae Ave/Primrose Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
28	Millbrae Ave/Whistler Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.5
29	Millbrae Ave/Langner Ave	TWSC	D	A	9.9
30	Millbrae Ave/Labath Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
31	Millbrae Ave/Dowdell Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.4

NOTE: 1 - Delay in seconds.
2 - Intersection only exists under Alternative A with project.
Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

Figure 4.8-22

traffic). Therefore, if mitigation measures are implemented as proposed in **Section 5.2.7**, no significant increase in daytime or nighttime collisions would occur.

LAND USE

Land use effects would be similar to those of Alternative B, except at a somewhat reduced scale due to the reduced size of development for Alternative E. A less-than-significant effect to land use would occur. The terms of the City MOU would not apply to Alternative E. Nonetheless, a significant loss of open space would not occur given the large amount of open space that would be retained under Alternative E.

AGRICULTURE

Under Alternative E, a business park complex would be developed on the northwest corner of the Stony Point site. Impacts would be similar to Alternative B, but lessened somewhat due to the reduced development footprint of Alternative E. As with Alternative B, two options exist for wastewater treatment and disposal that could potentially have different impacts to agricultural resources. The development of Alternative E Option 1 (**Figure 2-26**), would directly convert 70.9 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 31.1 acres (of the 70.9 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland 3.1 acres are considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 70.9 acres represent approximately 0.0055 percent of the farmland in the County. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that crop growth on the land is limited to a small number of crops and requires special management. The site assessment rating of the Stony Point site has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total for Alternative E, Option 1 is 151 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**).

The development of Alternative E Option 2 (**Figure 2-27**), would directly convert 74.7 acres of rural lands to urban uses. According to the NRCS, 35 acres (of the 70.9 acres) are considered prime and unique farmland and 3.1 acres are considered farmland of statewide and local importance. The 70.9 acres represents approximately 0.0061 percent of the farmland in the County. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that crop growth on the land is limited to a small number of crops and requires special management. The site assessment rating has been computed at 64 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total for Alternative E, Option 2 is 105 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix P**).

As discussed under Alternatives B, C, and D, the four parcels in the southern portion of the Stony Point site are under Williamson Act Contracts. To date, no application for non-renewal of the contracts has been submitted for any of the parcels within the Stony Point site. Proposed parking areas and roadways would function as buffers between agricultural operations and outdoor activity areas, thereby reducing the potential for conflicts to occur even though the Sonoma

County Right to Farm Ordinance would not apply. Furthermore, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the project site.

Given the inferior quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the combined FPPA score of 105, the retention of the southern Williamson Act parcels for agricultural purposes, and the avoidance of land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, Alternative E would have a less-than-significant impact on agriculture.

4.8.7 ALTERNATIVE F – LAKEVILLE CASINO

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Figure 4.8-23 illustrates the 2008 lane geometry and traffic control in the vicinity of the Lakeville site. **Figure 4.8-24** shows the no project PM peak traffic volumes in the vicinity of the Lakeville site.

Site Access

The Lakeville site has two existing accesses from Lakeville Highway. The main drive would be in front of the proposed casino and hotel approximately one-mile north of the SR-37/Lakeville Highway intersection. The driveway provides direct access to large surface parking lots near the highway. The other access is approximately a half-mile away, near the south boundary of the parcel and because of its orientation would be lightly used as an exit from the site. To be conservative, all project traffic was assumed to enter and exit the main driveway. Currently, neither access is signalized.

Construction Impacts

Construction Material Import – It is estimated that 404,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required to develop the Lakeville site. It is expected that construction of the project would involve 338,000 cubic yards of earthwork from an on-site location adjacent to the development area which would not generate any traffic on the surrounding roadways.

The project would also involve the transfer of fill from a nearby borrow pit to obtain the approximate 66,000 cubic yards that the project grading plan calls for that are not available from on-site excavation. There is a quarry approximately nine miles north of the Lakeville site where the fill can be imported. Trucks would arrive/depart to the off-site fill location from the Main Project Driveway on Lakeville Highway. Based on a carrying capacity of 12 cubic yards per truck, it is estimated that it would take approximately 5,500 trucks to complete this task. Doubling to account for the inbound and outbound component of each round trip, this would

Figure 4.8-23

Figure 4.8-24

result in approximately 11,000 trip ends. Assuming that these were spread out over a period of one month, with trucks operating at 6 days per week, 10 hours per day, this would result in 230 trucks making 460 trip ends on an average day with 23 trucks making 46 trip ends in any given hour (including potentially the peak hour).

Once the site is graded, the project would also require the importation of construction material including, raw materials, the building pad, concrete, the parking lot base and asphalt paving. This results in a material importation of 3,000 to 4,000 truckloads of material which would occur over approximately 23 months. The importation will require approximately 8 to 9 truck trips per day outside of the off-site fill delivery. Each truck would generate 1 inbound and 1 outbound trip, accounting for 2 trips. Therefore, during the peak construction period the project would generate about 18 truck trips ends per day.

Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less traffic than the project's equivalent passenger car traffic generation (even when added to employee trips) and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it should not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection. The construction traffic impact would represent a temporary and less-than-significant inconvenience to travelers on affected roadways and area residents. However, this level of truck traffic may have an impact on quality of life including increased noise, visual impact, and a perception of lower traffic safety. Tracking of debris and mud onto roadways may create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction. create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

Trip generation for Alternative F would be the same as for Alternative A (**Table 4.8-5**). It was estimated that 40 percent of the project traffic would be distributed to the east towards Vallejo with the remaining 60 percent distributed west towards San Rafael and to destinations north of the site. No project traffic would be generated or attracted in the immediate vicinity of the Lakeville site. **Figure 4.8-25** shows the project-generated PM traffic volumes for Alternative F. The project traffic distribution is shown in **Figures 4.8-26** and **4.8-27.**

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Project trips generated by the proposed casino and hotel were added to the year 2008 forecast freeway volumes. Freeway segment analyses were limited to the mix-use travel lanes, which are expected to have significantly more congestion than the future HOV lanes.

Figure 4.8-25

Figure 4.8-26

Figure 4.8-27

Table 4.8-20 summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative F highway segment and ramp performance condition. The 2008 Without Project Condition is provided as a baseline. As shown in **Table 4.8-20**, the following freeway segments and ramps would operate unacceptably in 2008 after the addition of Alternative F traffic:

- SR-37 between Atherton Avenue and Lakeville Highway (EB)
- Lakeville Highway between SR-37 and Site (NB)
- Lakeville Highway between Site and SR-116 (NB)
- SR-121 between SR-37 and SR-116 (NB)
- SR-121 between SR-116 and SR-37 (SB)
- Lakeville Highway between SR-37 and Site (SB)
- Lakeville Highway between Site and SR-116 (SB)
- Lakeville Highway between SR-116 and Frates Road (NB)
- Lakeville Highway between Pine View Way and SR-116 (SB)

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

The 2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative F. **Table 4.8-21** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative F Peak Hour intersection conditions. The 2008 Without Project Condition is provided as a baseline. Under the 2008 Plus Alternative F Conditions, the following study intersections are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

- Lakeville Highway / SR-116
- Lakeville Highway/SR 37
- Lakeville Highway/Main Project Access
- Lakeville Highway/Main Project Access
- SR-121 / SR-116
- SR-121 / SR-37
- SR-29 / SR-37 EB Off-Ramp

Figure 4.8-28 shows the 2008 Plus Project PM traffic volumes at each of the study intersections for Alternative F.

Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Results of the analysis showed that the following intersections would satisfy traffic signal Warrant #3 by year 2008 with the addition of Alternative F traffic:

- Lakeville Highway/Main Project Access
- Lakeville Highway/SR-116
- SR-121/SR-116

- Walnut Avenue / SR-37 EB Ramps
- Wilson Avenue / SR-37

TABLE 4.8-20
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE
2008 – ALTERNATIVE F

Highway Section/Ramp	Criteria	2008		2008 with Alt. F	
	LOS	LOS	MOE*	LOS	MOE*
Eastbound / Northbound					
Atherton Avenue EB Off- Ramp	C	C	23.1	C	27.6
SR-37 between Atherton Avenue and Lakeville Hwy (EB)	C	C	22.3	**D**	**27.1**
Lakeville Highway between SR-37 and SR-116 (NB)	C	**E**	**90.9% 39.9**	-	-
Lakeville Highway between SR-37 and Site (NB)	C	-	-	**F**	**95.7% 24.6**
Lakeville Highway between Site and SR-116 (NB)	C	-	-	**E**	**91.2% 37.9**
SR-37 between Lakeville Highway and SR-121 (EB)	C	C	20.7	C	25.5
Lakeville Highway between SR-116 and Frates Road (NB)	C	**E**	**89.7% 40**	**E**	**91.0% 38.4**
Lakeville Highway between Frates Road and US-101 (NB)	C	B	17.5	C	18.3
SR-121 between SR-37 and SR-116 (NB)	C	**E**	**88.3% 40.4**	**E**	**88.6% 39.6**
Walnut Avenue EB Off-Ramp	C	B	15.5	B	19.6
Walnut Avenue EB On- Ramp	C	B	15.0	B	18.5
Wilson Avenue EB Off- Ramp	C	B	14.9	B	18.8
Wilson Avenue EB On- Ramp	C	B	16.9	B	20.0
SR-29 EB Off- Ramp	C	B	11.7	B	15.2
Westbound / Southbound					
SR-29 WB Off- Ramp	C	A	-4.0	A	0.7
SR-29 WB On- Ramp (loop)	C	B	11.7	B	15.2
SR-29 WB On- Ramp	C	B	13.0	B	17.0
Wilson Avenue WB Off- Ramp	C	B	10.9	B	14.8
Wilson Avenue WB On- Ramp	C	B	14.6	B	19.1
Walnut Avenue WB Off- Ramp	C	A	4.5	A	8.9
Walnut Avenue WB On- Ramp	C	B	15.1	B	19.3
Lakeville Highway between US-101 and Pine View Way (SB)	C	B	13.5	B	14.5
Lakeville Highway between Pine View Way and SR-116 (SB)	C	**E**	**86.7% 40.5**	**E**	**88.9% 38.6**
SR-121 between SR-116 and SR-37 (SB)	C	**E**	**87.5% 40.6**	**E**	**88.1% 39.7**
SR-37 between SR-121 and Lakeville Hwy (WB)	C	B	15.9	C	21.3
Lakeville Highway between SR-116 and SR-37 (SB)	C	**E**	**86.1% 40.6**	-	-
Lakeville Highway between SR-37 and Site (SB)	C	-	-	**E**	**89.4% 38.2**
Lakeville Highway between Site and SR-116 (SB)	C	-	-	**F**	**94.6% 24.6**
SR-37 between Lakeville Highway and Atherton (WB)		A	10.9	B	15.0
Atherton Avenue WB Off- Ramp	C	B	13.4	B	17.3
Atherton Avenue WB On- Ramp	C	B	12.9	B	16.3
	C				

NOTE: Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS
*Measure of Effectiveness (MOE) for two lane highways = percent time following & average travel speed (mi/hr)
*MOE for multi-lane highways & ramps = density (pc/mi/ln)
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

TABLE 4.8-21
INTERSECTION LOS - ALTERNATIVE F

	Intersection	Criteria	Signal Control	2008			
				Base (w/o Project)		With Project	
				LOS	Delay*	LOS	Delay*
1	Atherton Avenue / Harbor Drive & SR-37 EB Off-Ramp	C	AWSC	A	9.4	A	9.7
2	Atherton Avenue / Glen Lane & SR-37 WB Ramps	C	TWSC	C	16.1	C	16.8
3	Lakeville Highway / SR-37	C	TS	C	28.4	**F**	**158.6**
4	Lakeville Highway / Main Project Access	D	TWSC	A	0.0	**F**	**OVRFL**
5	Lakeville Highway / SR-116	C	TWSC	**D**	**31.9**	**F**	**532.4**
6	SR-121 / SR-116	C	AWSC/TS	**F**	**116.6**	**F**	**139.8**
7	SR-121 / SR-37	C	TS	**D**	**43.9**	**F**	**102.2**
8	Walnut Avenue / SR-37 EB Ramps	C	TWSC	A	8.4	A	8.4
9	Mare Island / SR-37 WB Ramps	C	TWSC	A	0.0	A	0.0
10	Wilson Avenue / SR-37 EB Ramps	C	TWSC	B	14.4	C	18.4
11	Wilson Avenue / SR-37 WB Off-Ramp	C	AWSC	A	9.3	B	10.0
12	SR-29 / SR-37 EB Off-Ramp	C	TS	C	32.8	**D**	**44.6**
13	SR-29 / SR-37 WB Off-Ramp	C	TS	B	18.4	B	18.3
14	Lakeville Highway / US-101 SB Ramps	C	TS	C	25.9	C	28.2
15	Lakeville Highway / US-101 NB Ramps	C	TS	B	10.9	B	11.5

NOTES: *Delay in seconds. Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

Mitigation Measures

As shown above, Alternative F would have a significant impact on intersections and freeways segments and ramps. Mitigation measures for the 2008 Plus Alternative F conditions are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections and freeway segments/ramps that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS.

Figure 4.8-28

Potential Effects on Intersection Safety

Potential effects on intersection safety are not expected to differ substantially from Alternative A. Therefore, if mitigation measures are implemented as proposed in **Section 5.2.7**, no significant increase in daytime or nighttime collisions would occur.

LAND USE

Alternative F was analyzed with respect to its consistency with select goals, objectives, and policies in the Sonoma County General Plan. See **Table 4.8-4** for the results of this analysis. Alternative F would be consistent with the remaining select goals, objectives, and policies, as discussed in **Section 3.8.2**. As shown in **Table 4.8-4**, Alternative F is inconsistent with several local land use policies. Under Alternative F only Tribal or federal land use authority would apply to the Lakeville site as the project site would be taken into trust and local land use plans or policies would no longer apply. As with the above casino alternatives, inconsistency with local land use regulations would be expected for Alternative F. In addition, considering the zoning of the Lakeville site (Land Extensive Agriculture, 60 acres, and Scenic Resource designation), any development at the site would be expected to be inconsistent with local land use regulations. Alternative F would not result in any land use conflicts, however, such as an obstruction of access or the preclusion of allowable uses. Therefore, a less-than-significant land use effect would result.

Under Alternative F, the casino and hotel would be constructed on the Lakeville site, west of Lakeville Road. Approximately 79 acres out of a total of 321 acres would be developed. The remaining parcels in the Lakeville site would remain consistent with their current open space and agricultural use, resulting in a less-than-significant loss of open space.

AGRICULTURE

Under Alternative F, a casino and hotel would be developed on land adjacent to Lakeville Highway near the junction of Lakeville Highway and SR-37. This would result in the direct conversion of 103.9-acres of rural lands to urban uses. This land is not currently irrigated and is used for cattle grazing. According to the NRCS, the land proposed for development under each of the options for Alternative F does not consist of prime and unique farmland or farmland of statewide and local importance (**Appendix P**). In addition, the site does not contain property under the Williamson Act. Proposed parking areas and roadways would function as buffers between adjacent agricultural operations and outdoor activity areas, thereby reducing the potential for conflicts to occur, even though the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance would not apply. Furthermore, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the project site.

Due to the inferior quality of County land available for farming purposes on the site and the avoidance of land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, impacts to agriculture from the development of Alternative F are considered less than significant.

4.8.8 ALTERNATIVE G – NO ACTION

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

The No Action Alternative represents the evaluation of traffic conditions without the construction of the proposed casino and hotel. Under the No Action Alternative, it is assumed that future development of the Wilfred, Stony Point, and Lakeville sites would be guided by existing land use plans. Currently, there are no known development plans for the Stony Point and Lakeville sites. According to Northwest Specific Plan-South (NWSP), the northeastern corner of the Wilfred site would be developed with residential and commercial uses. (City of Rohnert Park, 2004). The NWSP area east of the Wilfred site proposes high-density residential, industrial, business park, and regional commercial development. The northeastern portion of the Wilfred site would be developed with residential land uses as intended under the NWSP.

The No Action Alternative would result in the traffic conditions described above as the baseline conditions for each target year. **Figure 4.8-2** shows the 2008 traffic volumes for the No Action Alternative. Freeway segment analyses results indicate that freeway segments would meet standards in 2008 under the No Action Alternative. Five intersections are projected to experience unacceptable levels of service in 2008 under the No Action Alternative:

- Wilfred Ave./Labath Ave
- Wilfred Ave./Redwood Ave
- Dowdell Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Rohnert Park Expressway/Redwood Drive
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

The CEQA process for development under the NWSP is expected to require mitigation measures to reduce traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level (similar to many of the measures included in **Section 5.2.7**). Alternative G would therefore result in impacts that are less than significant.

LAND USE

Under this alternative, current land uses would be retained on the Stony Point and Lakeville sites. The northeastern portion of the Wilfred site would be developed as intended under the Northwest Specific Plan, and convert approximately 63 acres of undeveloped land on the Wilfred site to commercial/residential uses. Given that this development would be consistent with the Northwest Specific Plan and no land use conflicts would occur, Alternative G would result in less-than-significant land use impacts.

AGRICULTURE

Under Alternative G, land uses on the Stony Point and Lakeville sites would remain the same. Agricultural uses would not be altered and grazing uses would continue. However, the northeastern portion of the Wilfred site would be developed with residential land uses as intended under the Northwest Specific Plan. This would directly convert approximately 63 acres of rural lands on the Wilfred site to urban uses. According to the NRCS, this area is not considered prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. Additionally, the northeastern parcels that would be developed under the Northwest Specific Plan do not contain lands protected under Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, because Alternative G would not result in a net loss of important or protected farmlands, impacts are less than significant.

4.8.9 ALTERNATIVE H –REDUCED INTENSITY (WILFRED SITE)

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This subsection discusses the build-out traffic conditions with the project trips calculated for Alternative H added to the baseline condition.

Site Access

The site access for this alternative is the same as for Alternative A.

Construction Impacts

It is estimated that 270,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required to develop the site for Alternative H. It is expected that construction would involve 25,000 cubic yards of earthwork from an on-site location adjacent to development area, which would not generate any traffic on the surrounding roadways. 245,000 cubic yards of fill would be taken from an on-site location separated from the development area, which would generate traffic on the surrounding roadways. The on-site separated location is the southern portion of the Wilfred site where truck traffic would travel on an approximately 5 mile loop from Rohnert Park Expressway to Stony Point Road to Wilfred Avenue to Redwood and back to Rohnert Park Expressway. Trucks would leave/enter the on-site fill location at the Rohnert Park Expressway driveway just east of the Bellevue-Wilfred Channel. The trucks would leave/enter the development area at the Wilfred/Labath intersection. Assuming that these were spread out over a period of 5 months, with trucks operating at 6 days per week, 10 hours per day, this would result in 171 trucks making 342 trip ends on an average day with 17 trucks making 34 trip ends in any given hour (including potentially the peak hour) on the 5 mile loop.

Once the site is graded, the project would also require the importation of construction material including, raw materials, the building pad, concrete, the parking lot base and asphalt paving. This results in a material importation of 3,000 to 4,000 truckloads of material which would occur over

approximately 23 months. The importation would require approximately 8 to 9 truck trips per day outside of the off-site fill delivery. Each truck would generate 1 inbound and 1 outbound trip, accounting for 2 trips. Therefore, during the peak construction period the project would generate about 18 truck trips ends per day.

Because the import truck traffic generates significantly less traffic than the project's equivalent passenger car traffic generation (even when added to employee trips) and the vehicle path travels through generally uncongested intersection movements, it should not significantly impact the capacity of any study intersection. The construction traffic impact would represent a temporary and less-than-significant inconvenience to travelers on affected roadways and area residents. However, this level of truck traffic may have an impact on quality of life including increased noise, visual impact, and a perception of lower traffic safety. Tracking of debris and mud onto roadways may create a perceptual impact as well as a physical impact. Mitigation measures are included in **Section 5.2.7** to minimize the impacts associated with construction.

Project Trip Generation

As summarized in **Table 4.8-22,** Alternative H would generate 949 new trips to the circulation network in the AM peak hour and 1,580 new trips in the PM peak hour. Although project trip generation was prepared for both the AM and PM peak hours, only the PM peak hour was evaluated in the traffic study as it represents the time period for which the project would contribute to the greatest amount of congestion and potential mitigation. In addition, only PM peak-hour future-year traffic forecast data was available from the City of Rohnert Park to complete a cumulative analysis.

TABLE 4.8-22
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE H

Land Use	Trips						
	Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Entering	Exiting	Total	Entering	Exiting	Total
Casino & Entertainment 315,100 square feet	12,424	651	279	930	827	733	1,560
Hotel 100 room[1]	272	12	7	19	11	9	20
Net New Vehicle Trips	*12,696*	*663*	*286*	*949*	*838*	*742*	*1,580*

NOTE:1 Trip rate is ITE Land Use Code 310 – Hotel. Rate reduced by 2/3 to account for internal capture to/from casino.
SOURCE:Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.\

Sometimes development also attracts trips that are already on the road and stop as they pass by the site. These are not new vehicle trips, but are considered to be pass-by trips. Although it is likely that some trips to the site would be pass-by trips, no empirical data was readily available to

determine a reasonable pass-by rate. Therefore, pass-by trips are conservatively not assumed in the Alternative H analysis.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

The project trip distribution and assignment for this alternative is the same as Alternative A. The project traffic distribution is shown in **Figures 4.8-29** and **4.8-30**.

Freeway Segment and Ramp Performance

Table 4.8-23 summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative H freeway segment and ramp performance condition. Under 2008 with Alternative H conditions, there are no freeway segments and ramps that have an unacceptable LOS.

Peak Hour Intersection Performance

The 2008 Without Project Condition traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative H. **Figure 4.8-31** shows the PM traffic volumes without the project.

Figure 4.8-32 shows the PM traffic volumes with the project. **Table 4.8-24** summarizes the 2008 Plus Alternative H Peak Hour intersection conditions. Signal controls are listed as TS for a signalized intersection and TWSC for a two-way stop-controlled intersection. Additional detail is provided in **Appendix O**. As shown in the results, the following intersections will fail to meet acceptable level of service thresholds based on established significance criteria and with the addition of project-related traffic:

- Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive
- Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue
- Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road
- Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard
- Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard
- Commerce Boulevard/US-101 NB Ramp

Figure 4.8-29

Figure 4.8-30

TABLE 4.8-23
FREEWAY SEGMENT AND RAMP PERFORMANCE
2008 - ALTERNATIVE H

US-101 Section/Ramp	Criteria LOS	2008 with Alternative H	Density (pc/mi/ln)[1]
Northbound			
US-101 South of SR_116	E	C	24.1
SR-116 Off-ramp	E	D	32.8
SR-116 On-ramp	E	D	34.0
US-101 between SR-116 and Rohnert Park Expressway (NB)	E	D	28.4
Rohnert Park Expressway NB Off-Ramp	E	D	33.8
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	C	23.4
Rohnert Park Expressway NB On-Ramp	E	C	27.7
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (NB)	E	C	27.7
Wilfred Ave NB Off-Ramp	E	C	27.7
Wilfred Ave NB On-Ramp	E	D	31.2
US-101 between Wilfred Ave and Santa Rosa Avenue	E	D	31.2
Santa Rosa Avenue NB Off-ramp	E	D	31.2
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue	E	C	23.2
Southbound			
US-101 North of Santa Rosa Avenue (SB)	E	C	25.5
Santa Rosa Avenue On-ramp (SB)	E	-	-
US-101 between Santa Rosa Avenue and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	E	35.1
Wilfred Ave SB Off-Ramp	E	E	40.2
Wilfred Ave SB On-Ramp	E	E	40.9
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and Wilfred Ave (SB)	E	E	40.9
Rohnert Park Expressway SB Off-Ramp	E	E	40.9
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp (Loop Ramp)	E	D	33.1
Rohnert Park Expressway SB On-Ramp	E	D	33.9
US-101 between Rohnert Park Expressway and SR-116 (SB)	E	D	26.8
SR-116 SB Off-ramp	E	D	33.6
SR-116 SB On-ramp	E	E	36.4
US-101 South of SR-116 (SB)	E	D	26.5

NOTE: 1pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane.
2Intersection no longer exists due to planned roadway improvement.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008; AES 2007.

TABLE 4.8-24
INTERSECTION LOS – ALTERNATIVE H

	Intersection	Signal Control	Criteria	2008 with Alternative H	
				LOS	Delay[1]
1	Wilfred Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**OVRFL**
2	Wilfred Avenue/Primrose Avenue	TWSC	D	B	12.7
3	Wilfred Avenue/Whistler Avenue	TWSC	D	B	12.6
4	Wilfred Avenue/Langner Avenue	TWSC	D	C	20.1
5	Wilfred Avenue/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**557.9**
6	Wilfred Avenue/Dowdell Avenue	TWSC	D	**F**	**323.7**
7	Wilfred Avenue/Redwood Drive	TS	D	**F**	**83.4**
8	Redwood Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	C	24.6
9	Wilfred Avenue/ US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	**C**	**24.0**
10	Golf Course Drive/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**F**	**82.7**
11	Golf Course Drive/Roberts Lake Road	TS	C	B	17.9
12	US-101 NB Ramps/Commerce Boulevard	TS	D	**E**	**63.3**
13	Project Driveway/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	A	0.0
14	Business Park Drive/Labath Avenue	TWSC	D	A	9.8
15	Business Park Drive/Redwood Drive	TWSC	D	D	27.5
16	Rohnert Park Expressway/Stony Point Road	TS	B	B	19.6
17	Rohnert Park Expressway/Labath Avenue	TS	C	C	29.6
18	Rohnert Park Expressway/Redwood Drive	TS	C	C	25.7
19	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 SB Ramps	TS	D	B	16.3
20	Rohnert Park Expressway/US-101 NB Ramps	TS	D	B	15.6
21	Rohnert Park Expressway/Commerce Boulevard	TS	C	**D**	**40.6**
22	SR-116/Stony Point Road	TS	D	D	36.9
23	SR-116/Redwood Drive	TS	D	C	26.8
24	SR-116/ SB US-101 Ramps	TS	D	B	19.0
25	SR-116/NB US-101 Off-ramp	TS	D	B	11.2
26	Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road	TWSC	D	**F**	**61.3**
27	Millbrae Ave/Primrose Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.6
28	Millbrae Ave/Whistler Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
29	Millbrae Ave/Langner Ave	TWSC	D	B	10.7
30	Millbrae Ave/Labath Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.7
31	Millbrae Ave/Dowdell Ave	TWSC	D	B	11.4

NOTE: 1Delay in seconds.
2-Intersection only exists under Alternative A with project.
Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2008; AES, 2007.

Figure 3.8-31

Figure 4.8-32

Results of the analysis showed that the following intersections would satisfy traffic signal Warrant #3 by year 2008:

- Stony Point Road/Wilfred Avenue
- Labath Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Dowdell Avenue/Wilfred Avenue
- Millbrae Avenue/Stony Point Road

Mitigation Measures

As shown above, Alternative H would not have a significant impact on intersections and freeway segments and ramps. Mitigation measures for Alternative H intersections are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS.

Potential Effects on Intersection Safety

Potential effects on intersection safety are not expected to differ substantially from Alternative A. Therefore, if mitigation measures were implemented as proposed in **Section 5.2.7**, no significant increase in daytime or nighttime collisions would occur.

LAND USE

Land use effects would be similar to those of Alternative A, except at a somewhat reduced scale due to the reduced size of development for Alternative H. Most development under Alternative H would be located within an area planned by the City of Rohnert Park for commercial/industrial/residential development (Northwest Specific Plan). Although the Northwest Specific Plan does not contemplate the development of a Class III casino, neither does any specific land use designation in California, since such developments are not legal on non-Indian lands. Thus, although most of the area proposed for development under Alternative H is currently planned for development, Alternative H would technically be inconsistent with local land use plans. However, under Alternative H the project site would be taken into trust and local land use plans or policies would no longer apply. Therefore, Alternative H would not result in any significant environmental impacts to land uses such as land use conflicts. Examples of land use conflicts would include an obstruction of access or the preclusion of allowable uses.

In addition, the development of Alternative H would be located within a community separator as designated by the County Open Space Element, and is planned for future development similar to Alternative A. The development would also be located away from the nearby mobile home park.

As with Alternative A, the MOU with the City of Rohnert Park provides that the Tribe make monetary contributions which would go towards the purchase of open space. Therefore, development of Alternative H would have a less-than-significant impact on regional open space.

AGRICULTURE

The development of Alternative H would be similar to Alternative A, but at a smaller scale and would result in the direct conversion of up to 69.5 acres of rural lands to urban uses located on the northeastern portion of the Wilfred site. As discussed under Alternative A, the land proposed for development under Alternative H does not consist of prime and unique farmland or farmland of statewide and local importance (**Appendix P**).

As stated under Alternative A, four parcels totaling 181.71 acres in the southern portion of the Wilfred site are under Williamson Act contracts (**Figure 3.8-17**). Currently, no application for non-renewal has been submitted for any of the parcels within the Wilfred site. The wastewater treatment and disposal options for Alternative H are similar to those under Alternative A. Therefore, this would be considered an allowable use under the Williamson Act. Even though the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance would not apply the proposed parking areas and roadways would function as buffers between adjacent agricultural operations and outdoor activity areas, thereby reducing the potential for conflicts to occur. Furthermore, the Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the project site.

Given the inferior quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the retention of the southern Williamson Act parcels for agricultural purposes, and the avoidance of land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, Alternative H would have a less-than-significant impact on agriculture.